







**ANGLICAN ORDINATIONS.**





THE  
VALIDITY  
OF  
ANGLICAN ORDINATIONS  
EXAMINED;  
OR,  
A REVIEW  
OF CERTAIN FACTS REGARDING THE CONSECRATION OF MATHEW  
PARKER, FIRST PROTESTANT ARCHBISHOP OF  
CANTERBURY:  
BY

THE VERY REV. PETER RICHARD KENRICK, *N. G.*

---

· Prove all things : hold fast that which is good."—1 Thes. v. 21.

---

PHILADELPHIA:  
PUBLISHED BY EUGENE CUMMISKEY,  
No. 130, South Sixth Street.

.....  
1841.

Entered according to the Act of Congress in the year 1841, by

**EUGENE CUMMISKEY,**

in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the Eastern District of  
Pennsylvania.

**PHILADELPHIA :**

**PRINTED BY KING AND BAIRD,**

**No 9, George Street.**

## CONTENTS.

PREFACE,	- - - - -	7
CHAPTER I.	- - - - -	13
Introduction.		
CHAPTER II.	- - - - -	25
Sentiments entertained by the Reformers, and first bishops of the Anglican Church, on the necessity of orders.		
CHAPTER III.	- - - - -	37
First Anglican bishops reproached by their Catholic contemporaries with having received no ordination.		
CHAPTER IV.	- - - - -	61
General observations on the principles followed in examining the account of Parker's consecration.		
CHAPTER V.	- - - - -	67
Commission of 9th of September, 1559.		
CHAPTER VI.	- - - - -	77
General observations on the story of the Nag's-head consecration.		

CHAPTER VII.	- - - - -	85
Account of the Nag's-head consecration examined.		
CHAPTER VIII.	- - - - -	104
The Lambeth Consecration of Parker.		
CHAPTER IX.	- - - - -	111
Positive evidence in support of Parker's consecration at Lambeth, examined.		
CHAPTER X.	- - - - -	135
Barlow's consecration examined.		
CHAPTER XI.	- - - - -	150
On the form appointed to be used by the Ordinal of Edward VI.		
CHAPTER XII.	- - - - -	183
Conclusion.		
APPENDIX.	- - - - -	189

## PREFACE.

THE idea of composing the following work, was first suggested to me by the proposed publication of a small collection of tracts, on the subject of the ordinations of the Anglican Church, announced in the *Catholic Herald*, of this city. It appeared to others, as well as to myself, that such a collection, however in itself desirable, would not fully answer the end contemplated in its publication: as it would not be calculated to give a comprehensive view of the whole subject, and might sometimes embarrass the reader by the necessity of too frequent reference, in order to collect, on any one particular fact, whatever evidence might be found scattered throughout. I accordingly resolved to avail myself of the contents of the intended publication, and of such other sources of information on the subject, as were within my reach, and to give a full, and, as I hoped, a methodical view of the important controversy on English ordinations.

Many motives have induced me to undertake this labour. The high claims to church authority, lately put

forward, and very powerfully urged by a learned and respectable body of English Protestant Divines, are well calculated to make men not only examine the soundness of these principles, but also see that they do not err in their practical application. If, then, it can be shown that these principles are of, at least, very dubious application to the church which these Divines would willingly invest with the privileges contained in the commission given by Christ to his apostles ; if it can be shown that it is, to say the very least, an extremely doubtful matter, whether the very root and basis of the principle of church authority,—a validly ordained ministry,—subsists in the Anglican Church ; surely those who are sincere in the maintenance of such a principle will turn their eyes towards that Great Church, through which they claim to have derived their orders, but which has constantly refused to acknowledge the validity of their ordinations.

Another motive which had its influence with the writer of the following examination, was a sincere desire to promote what can never be a hopeless project to the christian heart,—the re-union of the Anglican with the Catholic Church. At first, indeed, it might appear, that the present publication is calculated to mar, rather than promote, the accomplishment of so desirable an object, on account of the bitter feelings it may excite, especially among the clergy, whose judgment cannot but be somewhat influenced by their personal interest in the controversy. Even others may regard the present appeal to public

opinion, as better calculated to widen the breach that now separates us, than to hasten the advent of that glorious day when we shall all meet in the unity of faith.

I have no doubt that such may be the immediate effect of this attempt to call public attention to this subject; but, far from considering this result as incompatible with the promotion of Christian union, I have always regarded it as an almost necessary preliminary to that measure. The Catholic Church will never recognize the English orders: of this all must be convinced: and hence, I am inclined to think that the last bar to union will not be so much difference of doctrine, as the personal considerations involved in the nullity of English ordinations. The skilful surgeon, who wishes to effect a permanent cure, is not deterred by the displeasure of his patient from probing to the bottom the wound under which he suffers; and he feels sustained against the irrational indignation of him who suffers the painful operation, by the conviction that thus and thus alone can be laid the foundation of a permanent cure. If the conviction of the nullity, or, at least, of the extremely doubtful character of the Anglican ordinations, in the minds even of a comparatively small number, be the ultimate result of the present investigation, the writer will feel that he has not laboured in vain; although, meanwhile, he should have been found to have innocently given cause to an increased bitterness of feeling on the part of those whose ministerial character he has presumed to question.



The opinion of Dr. Lingard, regarding the fact of Parker's consecration, expressed so strongly and so ably maintained by that learned writer, has also had its influence in directing my attention to the subject of this volume. It may, indeed, appear presumption in me to contest the reality of any fact which has the support of Dr. Lingard's powerful advocacy. Still I am satisfied that that distinguished writer, for whom I entertain a profound respect, can have no objection to have his opinion submitted to examination, especially as all that he has written on this subject,—at least, all that has come to my knowledge,—is given at full 'in the following pages. In venturing to disprove his arguments, I have been careful to avoid any thing that might be construed into a manifestation of personal disrespect, or that might seem to warrant the suspicion that I found it necessary to use any other mode of controverting his opinion, than a dispassionate examination of the motives on which it is grounded.

If it be necessary to add still something more to justify in the reader's mind the appearance of the present volume, I shall merely say, that the republication of the famous Courayer's Defence of English Ordinations, which is to form an early volume in the series of works that make up the "Churchman's Library," was an additional motive for me to devote a portion of my leisure to the review of that work, at least, so far as it consists of an examination of facts. Add to all this, the wish to vindicate the character

of the old English Catholic Divines, who impugned the validity of the Anglican ordinations, from the charges, so frequently made against them, of blind credulity or a determined will to deny the most certain facts; and the reader will see that I did not want sufficient motives to institute an inquiry, which many circumstances would have made me gladly see undertaken by a more competent person.

A word as to the manner in which I have treated this question. I have endeavoured to avoid every thing not necessarily connected with the validity of English ordinations; and have, therefore, omitted the consideration of some questions, that either do not concern the *facts* of the case, or, at most, can be regarded as of minor importance. I have stated the principles which I have followed in this examination; and have, in every instance that it was possible for me, as was very frequently the case, referred to the original authorities whom I had occasion to quote. Whether I have been always so fortunate as to arrive at the truth of some obscure facts mentioned in the following pages, or whether I have been always just in the inferences I have drawn from them, I do not presume positively to assert; although I am conscious of having employed all the diligence, and profited by all the opportunities of acquiring correct information, which I possessed; and I can safely say that I commenced, carried on, and concluded the inquiry, with no other object in view than to attain a knowledge of the truth.

## ERRATUM.

Page 141,       -   -   -   for "surname," read "name."

# ANGLICAN ORDINATIONS.

## CHAPTER I.

### Introduction.

IN the following pages I propose to examine the question, whether the ordinations of the Church by law established in England be valid,—and, consequently, whether we are to regard as validly ordained ministers of the Gospel those who have received orders in that Church, or, who, like the ministers of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, derive their orders from it. This is a question of fact, and not of doctrine. This fact is resolvable into two other facts of which it is composed, namely, first, whether the first bishop of the Church of England received consecration from a bishop who himself had been duly consecrated; and second, whether the form of such consecration was adapted for the purpose to which it was employed. The first of these two facts is to be established or impugned like any other event, purely by historic evidence; and although the second requires a reference to a subject of doctrinal discussion, I will endeavour in treating of it to keep within the bounds of what can be maintained by testimony.

Before entering on the subject, it may not be unnecessary to state what relation the proposed investigation has to the religious controversies of the day ; and, at the same time, to give such a sketch of the facts connected with the history of this controversy, as may enable the reader who has not heretofore turned his attention to the subject, to have a clear view of the nature of this discussion.

Whether the Anglican orders be valid or not, does not involve any dogma or principle of Catholic faith. The church recognizes the orders of the Greek and other schismatic churches, which have been, for ages, separated from her communion ; nor would she hesitate to admit those of the Anglican Church, were their validity sustained by the facts of the case. It would, therefore, be an erroneous impression, to suppose that Catholics have any possible inducement to deny the validity of the Anglican ordinations. So far from this being the case, it has been regarded by some as a great misfortune, that the succession of the ministry was not kept up in England, at the time of the miscalled Reformation in that country. Speaking of the attempt made by a French ecclesiastic, Courayer, to defend the ordinations of the English Church, Chardon says ;— “ It would have been desirable that he (Courayer) had cleared up all doubt on that subject, since there would then be one obstacle less to a reunion, of which we should never despair ; and this would attach still more closely to the Catholic Church, that illustrious nation, from which so many learned and holy men have sprung, and which, even now-a-days, is so famous for the number of virtuous and scientific men whom it produces ; who are distinguished from all the other Calvinists, by their regard for the episcopal hierarchy, whose rights and prerogatives

they zealously maintain.”\* It is not, then, from any principle she holds, or any apparent advantage the denial might be supposed to afford her, that the Catholic Church has constantly rejected the ordinations of the Anglican Church as invalid, but merely because the facts of the case do not warrant her in coming to any other conclusion.—Whether these facts are such as I have here represented them or not, the reader, who will accompany me in the following examination, will be enabled to decide.

It is here necessary to point out the distinction between a *valid* and a *lawful* ordination. The one is an act, to which nothing is wanting that is necessary to give it effect; whereas, the other is one, not only complete in itself, but conformable to the laws that have been made to direct and govern the power that produced it. Thus, for example, a clergyman who has been suspended from the exercise of his ministry, may, if he be so regardless of his duty, continue to officiate, and his official acts would, in most instances, be *valid*. They would not, indeed, be *lawful* acts, but, on the contrary, a sacrilegious abuse of the powers of the ministry. Hence, were a Catholic bishop to apostatize from the faith, and confer the order of priesthood on one of his partizans in error, his apostacy or heresy, would not invalidate the act, although it would render it plainly *unlawful*. And hence it is that the Catholic Church regards all ordinations that are made in the sects separated from her communion, as *unlawful*; but she only considers those *invalid*, in which either the ordaining prelate was not himself consecrated, or in which he employed a defective form, or in which he had no serious intention of performing a sacred rite.

\* Chardon, Histoire des Sacremens. De L'Ordre. Liv. I. c. 8

The foregoing explanations have been thought necessary, in order to show more clearly to the general reader, that a participation of the Apostolic ministry, by means of valid *ordination, does not suffice for the lawful exercise of its functions*: and hence that those who infer that the Anglican Church enjoys an apostolical succession, because, in their opinion, she has an apostolic ministry, overlook one of the most obvious, and most universally admitted principles of church government, and one which they themselves recognize. When a clergyman of the Church of England is silenced by his bishop, no orthodox Churchman attaches any importance to his ministrations. Why?—Because he has ceased to derive the *right* of ministering from the source in which ecclesiastical authority is presumed to dwell. Suppose, now, that there is not question of an individual, but of a body of clergymen,—of a bishop, or of many bishops, who revolt against the Church of which they were ordained ministers; and are, therefore, deprived by the proper authority of the *right* to continue to act as ministers of such church; surely no one will say that there is a shadow of difference in principle, between this case and that of an individual clergyman, silenced for errors or misconduct. Whatever ministerial acts such a body of men perform, are *unlawful*, and, therefore, in opposition to the authority from which they originally derived the right to minister. Those who follow them in their revolt from the Church, may say, as long as they please, that these men succeed those who had peacefully finished their course, and kept the faith which they have abandoned; but every unprejudiced observer will perceive, that where there is no identity of religious principle, no uniformity of faith, there cannot be any thing like apostolical succession; which consists in the continued transmission of the same

sacred deposit of doctrine from one pastor to his successor, and not in the mere fact that one bishop succeeds another in the same see, without any regard to the doctrines professed by each. Thus, to illustrate this position by the case at present in question; it is not denied that Cardinal Pole was followed in the see of Canterbury by Mathew Parker; but it is equally undeniable that Pole would have considered Parker a heretic, and that Parker regarded Pole as an idolater. To suppose, then, that they were both links of the same chain—both equally capable of transmitting the invaluable blessings of apostolical succession,—is to confound all notions, and contradict the most universally received maxims. As well might Cromwell be considered one of the Stuart Kings of England, or Napoleon Bonaparte one of the Bourbon race, as Mathew Parker—even if validly ordained—be regarded as a link added to the chain of Catholic archbishops of Canterbury, reaching down from St. Augustine to Cardinal Pole, in whom that illustrious series of pontiffs finally ceased.

And all this, I must again remind the reader, is to be understood, even in the supposition that the orders of the English Church are valid, and its clergy regularly ordained; so that it is not necessary for Catholics to disprove the Anglican orders, in order to defeat the claim to apostolic succession, so pompously put forward, especially in these times, by men who seem to have grown up amidst the evidences of their defective title, and yet to have learned no fact from history, no wisdom from experience, no counsel from the suggestions of cool and unbiased reason.

But although it be not necessary for Catholics to disprove the validity of the Anglican ordinations, in order to defeat the claim to apostolical succession, put forward by the clergy of that church: it is obvious that one of the simplest



means of defeating that claim, is to show, by a reference *to facts*, that the very foundation on which it is raised, is itself either positively disproved, or, at least, very uncertain, as must be evident to every one, acquainted with the circumstances of the case, and not influenced by any other motive than a love of truth. The Catholic can, then, defeat the Anglican's claim to apostolic succession without disproving the orders of the English Church; but the advocates of this latter cannot advance a single argument in support of the supposed succession of their bishops, without first PROVING the validity of their ordination.

From what has been hitherto said, it appears that the validity of the Anglican ordinations and the apostolical succession of the bishops of the Church of England are distinct questions, not necessarily connected with one another; at least, that the apostolic succession of pastors is not a necessary consequence of their being validly ordained. And hence, it is apparent that the exceptions taken to the Anglican ordinations do not necessarily follow either from Catholic principles, or from a desire to set aside the claim to apostolical succession on the part of the English bishops. Whether they are the quibbles of captious sophists, or the serious doubts and well grounded objections of conscientious men, I shall leave to the reader to determine.

In the sixteenth century, in the reigns of Henry VIII., Edward VI., and Elizabeth, the Church of England underwent a change, by which it was delivered from the "damnable idolatry" and superstition, in which, according to the book of Homilies, all ranks and conditions of christendom, had lain buried "for eight hundred years and more." It does not, of course, enter into the plan of this inquiry, to examine the merits or wisdom of the change, of which men will judge according to their different religious

convictions. But I must be pardoned for briefly noticing *one fashionable theory on this subject, which is, at the same time, so monstrously absurd, and so palpably inconsistent with the facts of the case, that a more convincing proof of the general ignorance regarding the causes and stages of the English Reformation among those who believe it, could not easily be adduced.* According to this theory, it was not the State that reformed the Church of England, but this change was brought about by the Church itself. So far, however, from this being the case, that in the first year of Elizabeth's reign, the Convocation of the English clergy made a profession of faith, quite conformable to the teaching of the Catholic Church, and, of course, quite in opposition to the doctrines and principles of the reformation. There were then but fourteen bishops in England; and they all remained faithful to Catholic principles; they unanimously proscribed the new errors. Of these, thirteen were deprived of their sees, for refusing to take the oath of supremacy; there was but one recreant of the episcopal body, who took the oath and thus preserved his see; but who yet remained steadfast in the Catholic faith. The Church of England did *not* then reform itself; it was crushed, and almost annihilated by the civil power; and in its place was established a new church, essentially different from that which had been swept away.

\* The sentiments of the Church of England in the first year of Elizabeth's reign, may be easily seen in the following declaration of both houses of Convocation, which was presented to Parliament in that same year,

"1. That in the Sacrament of the altar, by virtue of Christ's assisting, after the word is duly pronounced by the priest, the natural

In the organizing of this new church, a serious difficulty *was felt in providing it with an ecclesiastical hierarchy*, which should resemble, as far as possible, that which had been supplanted, to which the people had been accustomed, and which, it was feared, could not be dispensed with, without exposing the State to considerable peril, and probably rendering the experiment of a change in the nation's

body of Christ, conceived of the Virgin Mary, is really present under the species of bread and wine, as also his natural blood.

"2. That after the consecration there remains not the substance of bread and wine, nor any substance, save the substance of God and Man.

"That the true body of Christ and his blood is offered for a propitiatory sacrifice, for the quick and the dead.

"4. That the supreme power of feeding and governing the militant church of Christ, and of confirming their brethren, is given to Peter the apostle, and to his lawful successors in the see apostolic, as unto the Vicars of Christ.

"5. That the authority to handle and define such things which belong to faith, the sacraments, and the discipline ecclesiastical, both hitherto ever belonged, and only ought to belong to the Pastors of the Church, whom the Holy Spirit hath placed in the Church, and not unto laymen." (Heylin, p. 115.)

It is obvious that the Church, if left to itself, would never have reformed, in the sense usually attached to the word. It was accordingly set aside; and although the State employed some worthless and degraded ecclesiastics in effecting the change which the Church would never have made, it is obviously an abuse of language to call such an operation, a Reformation of the Church of England by herself. In the Appendix the reader will find a brief sketch of the English Reformation from the pen of Dr. Heylin, a zealous Anglican churchman, from which he will be fully enabled to say, whether the civil power did not cause the change, or if it can, with any degree of fairness, be attributed to the Church (See Appendix, A.)

faith more hazardous than ought in prudence to be attempted.

Mathew Parker was chosen to be the first Protestant archbishop of Canterbury. It is not pretended that he was consecrated by any of the Catholic bishops. According to the advocates of Anglican orders, he received episcopal consecration from Barlow, who had been made bishop by Henry VIII., and who, on this occasion, is said to have used the form of ordination, known as King Edward's form, in whose reign it had been introduced.

With regard to this important fact, there are three questions—all of which must be satisfactorily answered in the affirmative, before those who trace their orders to Mathew Parker, can conclude that they are validly ordained. First. Was Parker really consecrated by Barlow, in the manner described? Second. Was Barlow himself consecrated? Third. Was King Edward's form a valid form?

If these three questions can be satisfactorily answered, then the ordinations of the English Church are valid; its bishops have the same episcopal character as the Catholic bishops; its ministers are priests, equally as those who minister at Catholic altars; in a word, the ecclesiastical hierarchy has been preserved in the English Church, although, of course, being separated from the communion of the Catholic Church, they are withered branches through which the vivifying sap of apostolical jurisdiction does not circulate, and which, consequently, instead of bearing fruit, impede the rays of light and grace from reaching the deluded people that repose under their scanty shade.

But if a single one of the above three facts be disproved; if any one of them be not absolutely certain, although somewhat probable; if positive and unsuspicious testimony be not at hand whereby *all three* can be established; then

*the validity of the Anglican ordinations is either positively disproved, or not absolutely certain; and, consequently, there can be no obligation to listen to men, who cannot prove that they have received a participation of the apostolic ministry, whereby they are empowered to preach the gospel, and minister at the altar. Nothing short of certainty on this point, can, in such a case, justify priest or people in admitting the validity of such ordinations.*

Before concluding this chapter, I will add a few words regarding the history of this controversy, which is co-eval with the existence of the Anglican Church, and will, in all likelihood, continue until that church be again re-united with the See of Rome, or, being cast away by the civil power, from which it first derived existence, and by whose fostering care and paternal solicitude, it has been since maintained—shall be torn to pieces by the progress of dissent among her own children. The validity of the ordinations of the new church was warmly contested during the whole reign of Elizabeth; and of all the points then controverted between the Catholics and Anglicans, there is, perhaps, none which the former more repeatedly urged, than the defect of orders in their opponents. In the early part of the reign of James I., the controversy was renewed, or, to speak more correctly, continued; the reference to the register of Parker's consecration, found in the archives of Lambeth, then for the first time made, may be said to form an epoch in the history of the controversy. The authenticity of this register was denied by the Catholic writers, and as warmly maintained by their opponents;—and in the ninth Chapter of this work, the reader will find the principal arguments in support of each opinion. In the early part of the last century, the ordination question was again brought forward by Mr. Thomas Ward, a learned

·convert from Protestantism, who in his “Cantos on the English Reformation,” his “Errata of the Protestant Bible,” and “The controversy of ordination truly stated,” directed public attention to this subject, and gave occasion to a very ample developement of the curious facts connected with it. The republication of Ward’s “Controversy of ordination truly stated,” in Dublin, in 1807, drew forth from Dr. Elrington, of Trinity College, in that city, a reply, of which the reader will find a notice in the letter of Right Rev. Dr. Milner, found in the Appendix to this work.\* The name of Dr. Lingard has been introduced into this controversy, in consequence of a note to his History of England, in which he asserts the fact of Parker’s consecration at Lambeth; but in his letter, published in defence of this opinion, he has disclaimed any intention to pronounce thereby on the *validity* of the act, the truth of which he deems satisfactorily established. The most remarkable circumstance connected with this controversy, is, that the most successful defender of the Anglican ordinations, the very Achilles of the numerous bands that have been marshalled on this field of discussion,—was a Catholic priest, the too famous Courayer,† Canon regular of St.

\* See Appendix. (D.)

† See Appendix. (B.) Rev. Mr. Husenbeth, in his invaluable work, “Faberism exposed and refuted,” asks his Rev. antagonist, who had triumphantly referred to Courayer, for a solution of all difficulties on this very delicate subject.—“Has he” (Mr. Faber) “never heard of the Journalists of Trevoux,—of Le Quien,—of Hardouin,—of St. René,—of Cleophilus Alethes (*alias* Constable),—of Fennel,—who all refuted Courayer? Is he ignorant of the works of Sanders, Harding, Stapleton, Reynolds, Bristow, Allen, Kellison, Worthington, Champney, Talbot, Ward, Hatton, Dodd, Challoner, Milner, and Fletcher, who have all written powerfully against the validity of the Anglican orders?” p. 527.

Généviève, at Paris. In the Appendix will be found a sketch of this man's character, from which it will be evident that the Anglicans have little cause to glory in him as a partizan ; and in the course of the following investigation, it will be rendered manifest that notwithstanding the talent and learning with which he advocated their claims, he has failed to establish them on a solid foundation.

## CHAPTER II.

*Sentiments entertained by the Reformers, and first bishops of the Anglican Church, on the necessity of orders.*

ALTHOUGH the investigation on which I am about to enter, is one relating principally to facts, real or supposed, and not an examination of doctrines or opinions, it may not be unnecessary to begin by stating, what were the sentiments concerning the necessity of ordination and consecration, entertained, and publicly professed, by the first Reformers, and especially by the first prelates of the Anglican Church. The doctrines of Luther, Zuingle and Calvin on this subject, must have naturally influenced those who in England professed to adopt their opinions on other points. If it appear that these latter highly prized, and loudly proclaimed the necessity of receiving, episcopal consecration, then, indeed, we shall be prepared to believe that they omitted nothing which on their parts was required to obtain it; whereas, if it can be shown, that they regarded the ceremony of consecration as an useless, if not a superstitious, rite; that they publicly declared that the royal authority was all sufficient to confer order and jurisdiction; and that they frequently ridiculed the importance which Catholics attached to the sacred ceremony of consecration; it will not be too much to ask the reader to



bear this *fact* in mind, while engaged in the important investigation of another fact, namely, whether the first bishops of the Anglican church were actually consecrated?—and if so, in what manner?

The great parent of the so called Reformation, Martin Luther, openly taught that the ministers of religion differed in nothing from the laity, but by their *election* to the office of teacher. According to him, every christian is a priest. His words are: “Let every christian, therefore, acknowledge that we are all equally priests; that is, that we have the same power in the Word and in every sacrament; but that it is not lawful for each one to use that power, unless *elected* by the community, or *called* by the RULER.”<sup>\*</sup> According to this theory, there would be no necessity for ordination, as each member of the church is supposed to be invested with equal powers “in the word and in every sacrament,” by baptism; and *election* is only required, to prevent the confusion which would arise from each individual exercising the power he possessed. It is not necessary to refer to the sentiments of the other continental reformers on this subject; it being sufficiently notorious that they denied the efficacy of ordination.

To confine myself, then, to the English Reformers. We learn from a public document in Burnet, what were the sentiments of Archbishop Crammer on this important subject. The record, 21, in the Appendix to Burnet’s History of the Reformation, is entitled, “The Resolutions of several Bishops and Divines of some questions concerning

\* Agnoscat itaque quicumque se christianum esse cognoverit, omnes nos aequaliter esse sacerdotes, hoc est eandem in verbo et quocumque sacramento habere potestatem: verum non licere quemquam hac ip-sa uti, nisi consensu communitalis, aut vocatione majoris.” Lib. de Capt. Bab. t. ii. fol. 298.

*the sacraments."* One of these questions, the ninth, is thus proposed: "Whether the Apostles, lacking a higher power, as in not having a Christian King among them, made bishops by that necessity, or by authority given them by God?" In reply to this, the Archbishop of Canterbury, that is, Crammer, said: "All Christian princes have committed unto them immediately of God the whole cure of all their subjects, as well concerning the administration of God's word for the cure of souls, as concerning the administration of things political and of civil governance." In answer to the tenth question: "Whether bishops were before priests, or priests before bishops; and if so, did not the priests make the bishop?" he replied: "that the bishops and priests were at one time, and were no two things, but both one office in the beginning of Christ's Religion." To the eleventh question, he answered:—"A bishop may make a priest by the Scripture, and so may princes and governors also; and that by the authority of God." He says that laymen may make priests by election; and in answer to the twelfth question, he replies: "In the New Testament, he that is appointed to be a bishop or a priest, *needeth no consecration* by the Scripture; for election or appointing thereto is sufficient."\*

Besides these answers, we have the sentiments of Crammer on this subject thus given in the words of Burnet's abridger. "Crammer had at this time some particular opinions concerning ecclesiastical offices; that they were delivered from the King as other civil offices were, and that ordination was not indispensably necessary, and was only a ceremony, that might be used or laid aside; but

\* Burnet's History of the Reformation. Appendix, Records. No 21, p. 220—228. Edit. Lond. 1679.

that the authority was delivered to churchmen only by the King's commission."<sup>\*</sup> Nor was this royal supremacy, which, as we learn from the same writer, the clergy placed "in some extraordinary grace conferred on the King in his coronation,"<sup>†</sup> suffered to lie dormant. In common with all the other time serving bishops of that reign,—with, however, the glorious exception of Fisher of Rochester, who suffered death, rather than acknowledge the royal supremacy,—Cranmer gave a practical proof of his principles, by throwing up his commission, and consenting to receive jurisdiction from the lustful and sanguinary tyrant, Henry VIII. In the address to Henry on this occasion, the bishops state, "that all jurisdiction, civil and ecclesiastical, flowed from the King, and that they exercised it only at the King's courtesy; and as they had it of his bounty, so they would be ready to deliver it up, when he should be pleased to call for it." Accordingly, the King did empower them, in HIS STEAD, to give institution, and to do all the other parts of the episcopal function, which was to last during his pleasure; so that, as Burnet remarks, they were the King's bishops.<sup>‡</sup>

Cromwell, a layman, whom Henry had appointed his Vicar-General, took his seat in the convocation of the clergy, as head over them;§ at his coming into the house of convocation, all the bishops paid him honour,—and he sat in the highest place; he sent forth *injunctions* to all bishops and curates throughout the realm, *charging* them to execute various duties of their calling.||

On the accession of Edward, Cranmer took out a new commission to exercise his episcopal functions; in order

\* Burnet's Abridg. l. 1. 250. † Ib. lib. 2. 56. ‡ Abridg. 228.

§ Baker. p. 303.

|| Stowe. p. 574

to express more clearly his favourite principle, that all authority,—ecclesiastical no less than civil,—flowed from the throne. Every thing was done to confirm this error. The bishops were made by the King's letters patent, and not, as before, by the election of the Deans and Chapters; all processes and writings should be made in the King's name, only with the bishop's attestation appended to it, and they were sealed with no other seal than that of the King. "The intent of the contrivers of this act," says Dr. Heylin, "was by degrees to weaken the episcopal order, by forcing them from their strong hold of divine institution, and making them no other than the King's ministers only, his ecclesiastical sheriffs, to execute his will and dispense his mandates." Such was the practical effect of this principle, that the bishops were rendered incapable of conferring orders, unless they had previously been empowered by a special license; the tenor whereof was in these words. "The King to such a bishop, greeting. Whereas all and all manner of jurisdiction, as well ecclesiastical as civil, flows from the King, as from the supreme head of all the body, &c. We, therefore, give and grant to thee full power and license to continue during our good pleasure for holding ordination within thy diocese of N., and for promoting fit persons into holy orders, even to that of the priesthood."<sup>\*</sup>

The loose notions, or rather positive errors, of Cranmer and Barlow, on the subject of episcopal consecration, although already sufficiently well established, are thus fully acknowledged by Courayer. "It evidently appears that Cranmer and Barlow, two of the prelates appointed to reform the public liturgy and form of ordination, were noto-

\* Heylin. 51. 52.

riously erroneous in the matter of orders. To be convinced of this, we need go no farther than examine the questions concerning the sacraments, which were proposed to several prelates and some divines, whose opinions were required. In their answers to several questions proposed relating to the number of the sacraments, ordination is always excluded; excepting in their answer to the fourth question, where they extend the word sacrament to many things which are only figures or plainly ceremonies. In the answer to the seventh question, Cranmer and Barlow exclude ordination particularly from the number of the sacraments, as carrying no virtual efficacy with it. In a word, pure presbyterianism without disguise discovers itself in all the answers; and it is but too apparent that the chief aim of these divines and prelates was to extinguish episcopacy.”\*

Again:—

“In 1536, among many errors which he (Barlow) was accused of spreading, he was charged with having maintained this proposition: ‘That if the King’s Grace, being supreme head of the Church of England, did choose, denominate, and elect any layman (being learned) to be a bishop; that he so chosen (without mention made of any orders) should be as good a bishop, as he is, or the best in England.’† The most obstinate presbyterian never carried the no-necessity of ordination further.”‡

This might appear a suitable place for exposing a most dishonest artifice, by which Courayer endeavours to shew that the errors of Cranmer and Barlow had no influence in changing the form of the ordination under Edward VI.,

\* Courayer, p. 117.

† Collier, Hist. Tom. 2. p. 135.

‡ Courayer, p. 148.

were it not that the subject will more appropriately present itself in a future chapter, which will treat of that form. I have entered somewhat largely into these details ; because they best shew, what were the opinions of the first framers of the English Church, regarding the necessity of consecration ; and it is by these we are to be influenced in judging of their conduct, on the present occasion, rather than by whatever principles their successors may have found it convenient to adopt, or which the unanimous testimony of Christian antiquity may have caused them subsequently to acknowledge.

In the 24th of the 42 articles, agreed upon in the convocation of 1552, and published by the authority of Edward VI., it is expressly stated, “ that it is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching, or administering the sacraments in the congregation, before he be lawfully called, and sent to execute the same : and those we judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men, who have public authority given unto them in the congregation, to call and send ministers into the Lord’s vineyard.” This article is the 23rd of those adopted in 1562, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and known as the 39 articles of religion. The meaning of the article above quoted, is evidently presbyterian ; and Burnet, in expounding it, says, ‘ That should a company of Christians by common consent decree some of their own members to minister to them in holy things, —this is not condemned nor annulled by the article, for “ we are sure,” says he, “ that not only those who penned the articles, but the body of this Church, *for above half an age after*, did, notwithstanding these irregularities, acknowledge the foreign churches so constituted, to be true

churches as to all the essentials of a church.”<sup>a</sup> Indeed, it is only necessary to read the whole of his exposition of the 23rd article, to be convinced how little importance was attached, even in his days, to the regular transmission of orders. The lawful authority, which is to call to the ministry, is, according to him, the body of the pastors assembled, and acting agreeably to the laws of the state, without at all insisting on the necessity for these pastors themselves to have had any thing like regular ordination. Thus he says: “The article does not resolve this (lawful authority) into any particular constitution, but leaves the matter open and at large, for such accidents as *had happened*, and such as might still happen. They who drew it, had the state of the several churches before their eyes that had been differently reformed; and although their own had been less forced to go out of the beaten path than any other, *yet they knew that all things among themselves had not gone according to those rules that ought to be sacred in regular times*. Necessity has no law, and is a law in itself.”<sup>†</sup> And that such was the doctrine of the Church of England, for a long period subsequent to its birth, he thus expressly states, making a supposition which had been already verified in England:—“If it should happen that princes or states should take up such a jealousy of their own authority, and should apprehend that the suffering their subjects to go elsewhere for regular ordination, might bring them under some dependence on those that had ordained them. And if upon other political reasons, they had just cause of being jealous of that, and should thereupon hinder any such thing; in that case, neither our Re-

<sup>a</sup> Burnet's Exposition, art. 23, p. 257.

<sup>†</sup> I have italicised the words that bear most on the subject of this book.

formers, nor their successors, *for near eighty years after those articles were published*, did ever question the constitution of such churches.”\*

But we have still further evidence of the loose notions, regarding the necessity of orders, that prevailed among the early English Reformers, and which were acted upon not only during the latter years of Henry VIII.; and during the whole reign of Edward VI., but were adopted by the bishops of Elizabeth’s time. These, for the most part, had been engaged in the religious changes made by both the preceding monarchs: and the identity of belief on this point, between the convocations of 1548, and 1562, is shewn by the adoption of the article above referred to in the latter convocation, at which Parker, Grindal, Cox, etc., assisted; as also by the addition made to the the 26th of Edward’s articles, which is the 25th of those framed in Elizabeth’s reign. This addition is remarkable; because in Edward’s article, any visible rite or ceremony was not positively excluded, in the conferring of orders; but in the 25th of the present Thirty-Nine articles, it is declared that “those five, commonly called sacraments, that is to say, confirmation, penance, orders, matrimony and extreme unction, are not to be accounted for sacraments of the gospel; being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the apostles, partly are states of life allowed by Scriptures, but yet have not like nature of sacraments with baptism, and the Lord’s supper, *for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God.*”† This doctrine of the Anglican Church, for *at least half an age after*, as Bishop Burnet very drily tells us, was so openly avowed, that a defender of the 39 articles, Mr. Rogers, wrote:—“None

\* Exposition, art. 23, p. 260.

† Heylin, Appendix. p. 189.



but disorderly papists will say that order is a sacrament." And he asks: "where can it be seen in *Holy Scriptures* that orders or priesthood is a sacrament? What form has it? What promise? What institution from Christ?"\*

The assertion of Bishop Burnet, that for eighty years after the foundation of the English Church, very loose notions with regard to the necessity of episcopal consecration prevailed in England, is illustrated by two facts, mentioned by Courayer. In the year 1610, James I. of England, wishing to introduce episcopacy into Scotland, caused some presbyterian clergymen of that country to receive episcopal consecration at the hands, I believe, of Bancroft, archbishop of Canterbury. They had already been made presbyters, by the kirk: and the question was, whether they should be re-ordained presbyters, or be at once made bishops. Some, at least one, of the English bishops insisted on the necessity of their being re-ordained deacons and presbyters; inasmuch as they had never received these orders from a bishop; but "Bancroft, archbishop of Canterbury," says Courayer, "maintained that the ordination given by priests ought to be esteemed valid, tho' it was not administered by bishops; for otherwise the greatest part of the reformed Churches would be found to want ministers."†

In the year 1664, two years after the famous addition to the ordinal of Edward VI., of which I shall speak more at length hereafter, a similar case occurred. Four Presbyterian ministers of Scotland coming into England for the purpose of receiving orders, were ordained deacons and subsequently promoted to higher orders.‡ This opposite line of conduct, in circumstances precisely similar,

\* Defence of the 39 articles, p. 154, 155.

† Defence of English ordinations; pa. 22. ‡ Collier, t. 2 p. 587

shows that a silent reformation had taken place in the minds of the English hierarchy, on the all important subject of the necessity of episcopal ordination. These facts, however they may be attempted to be explained away, are in strict accordance with what we learn from Burnet, concerning the change in the sentiments of the English Church.

If further proof were required, to show the light in which "orders" were viewed by Parker and his fellow bishops, it is afforded by the Convocation of 1562,—the same in which the thirty nine articles were agreed to. The Bible, which was published by authority of this Convocation, and, therefore, called the "Bishops' Bible," clearly shows the Calvinistic tendency of the Anglican bishops. None but those imperfectly acquainted with the real character of these men, will be astonished to hear, that they wilfully corrupted the Sacred Text, in order to sanction their erroneous principles. Not to speak at present of other changes made for the same purpose, the 22nd verse of the 14th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles was thus translated: "And when they had ordained elders by ELECTION, in every congregation." This corruption continued in all the editions of the Bible, until the reign of James I., when the present authorized version was made. Further on, I shall have occasion to direct attention to other corruptions of the Sacred Text, made for the same purpose; but what is here said appears abundantly sufficient to show that—to use the words of Dr. McCrie—"the first English Reformers, by no means considered ordination by the parent church, or descending from the parent church, as necessary. They would have laughed at the man who would have asserted seriously, that the imposition of the hands of the bishop was essential to the validity of ordination. They would not have owned that

person as a protestant, who would have ventured to insinuate, that, where this was wanting there was no christian ministry; no ordinance; no church;—and, perhaps, no salvation. The private opinions of the first English reformers were similar to those of the reformers of Switzerland and Geneva; Hooper, in a letter, dated Feb. 8, 1550, informs Bullinger that the archbishop of Canterbury, the bishops of Rochester, Ely, St. David's, Lincoln, and Bath, agreed, *in all things*, with the Helvetic churches. Packhurst, bishop of Norwich, in a letter to Gualter, does the same."

From all these *facts*, and many others which might be adduced, it is obvious that neither Cranmer in 1536, nor Parker and his associate in 1562, attached any importance to the rite of episcopal consecration:—a conclusion which should be constantly kept in mind, while engaged in the following investigation.

## CHAPTER III.

First Anglican bishops reproached by their Catholic contemporaries with having received no ordination.

AMONG the earliest of the public denials of the consecration of Parker and his associates, the most remarkable dates so far back as the year 1566; and had all the notoriety that a public fact could possibly acquire. The matter is thus narrated by Mr. Ward. "By the first session of that parliament, 5 Eliz. I. power was given to any bishop in the realm, to tender the oath of supremacy, enacted 1 Eliz., to any ecclesiastical person within his diocese; and the refuser was to incur a *premunire*. By virtue of this statute, Mr. Robert Horn, pretended bishop of Winchester, tenders the oath to Dr. Bonner, bishop of London, but deprived by Queen Elizabeth, and then a prisoner in the Marshalsea, which was within the diocese of Winchester: Bonner refuses to take it. Horn certifies his refusal into the King's Bench: whereupon Bonner was indicted upon the statute. He prays judgment, whether he might not give in evidence on this issue: 'that he was not culpable, because the said Horn, called bishop of Winchester, was not bishop when he tendered the oath.' And it was resolved by all the judges at Sergeant's Inn, in judge Catlin, the Chief Justice's chamber, 'That if the verity and matter be so, indeed, he should well be received to give in

evidence upon this issue, and the jury should try it.' Now, what the trial was appears by that he was not condemned, nor ever any further troubled for that case, though he was a man especially aimed at. And at the next sessions of that Parliament, which was the 8th of Elizabeth, they were forced, for want, you see, of a better character, to beg they might be declared bishops by act of Parliament."\* The account given by the protestant historian, Fuller, in his Church History, so exactly coincides with that of Mr. Ward, that I shall only quote that part of it that throws light on what was the real difficulty of the case. After mentioning that Bonner's counsel pleaded three legal informalities, as a bar to the indictment, which were, however, over-ruled by the Judges, he says,—“The main matter, which was so much debated among all the Judges, in the Lord Cateline his chamber, was this:

“Whether Bonner could give in evidence of that issue that he had pleaded of not guilty, that Horne bishop of Winchester was not a bishop, *tempore oblationis sacramenti*, at the time he tendered the oath unto Bonner.

“And it was resolved by them all, that if the truth of the matter was so indeed, that he might give that in evidence upon that issue, and that the Jury might try whether he was a bishop then or not.”†

After stating the interference of the Queen's Parliament, he says:—“The seasonable interposing of the statute made it a drawn battell between Horne and Bonner.”‡

\* See Abridg. of Dyer's Reports, 7. Eliz. fol. 231, quoted by Ward in his *Errata to the Protestant Bible*, p. 71. Philadelphia, 1824.

† Fuller, Church History, Book IX., p. 80.—He also quotes Dyer, fol. 231. Mich. 6 and 7 Eliz. placito 15.

‡ Ib. p. 80.

*This fact is not disputed by the advocates of Anglican ordinations; although they deny that it affords evidence that Horn was not a bishop, at the time of its occurrence; because, say they, Bonner's plea was grounded on a mere legal informality in Horn's consecration. Horn is stated to have been consecrated according to the Ritual of Edward VI., which had been abolished by an act of Parliament in the Reign of Queen Mary, and was not revived, at least, by name, in the reign of Elizabeth, until subsequently to the date assigned for the consecration of Horn; this legal defect, it is concluded, furnished Bonner with a plea for not acknowledging the episcopal character of Horn. Now, although Bonner's denial of Horn's episcopal character is sufficient for my present object, without imposing on me the necessity of entering into an investigation of the reasons he may have had, I cannot but think that there must have been something more than the supposed legal defect in the form by which he was consecrated. I do not deny that Bonner maintained that Horn was not a bishop, such as the laws of England recognized; because these laws required valid consecration, according to the canons of the church: but I am much inclined to question that he chiefly relied on the non-revival of Edward's ordinal as the proof of their illegality. I am aware how confidently this is urged by the defenders of Anglican Ordinations; that it is adduced by Ward to disprove the Lambeth-consecration; and that other Catholic writers have regarded it as *one* of the causes of the act of 8th Elizabeth, by which all defects in that action were supplied by the omnipotence of the English Parliament. I must, however, be permitted to think that were Bonner's plea sustained by no other reason, it would have been disallowed for the following reasons.*

By a special act of Parliament, passed in 1552, the ordinal for the consecration of archbishops, bishops, etc. was ANNEXED to the book of Common Prayer which had already been established in 1549. The words of this Act are:—"and by the same authority, Parliament hath ANNEXED and joined a form and manner of making and consecrating of Archbishops;—and also the said form of making Archbishops, bishops, priests and deacons hereunto annexed—as it was in the former book."\* By the act of 1st of Mary, 1553, the Common Prayer Book, and the ordinal annexed thereto, were abrogated, "and all such divine service and administration of the sacraments as were most commonly used in England in the last year of King Henry VIII." restored.† In the 1st of Elizabeth, on 24th of June 1559, the act of Mary, of 1553, was *repealed*; and that portion of it relating to the Book of Common Prayer, is as follows:—"And that the said book, *with the orders of service, and of the administration of sacraments*, rites and ceremonies, with the alterations and *additions* therein added and appointed by the statute, shall stand and be from and after the said feast (of the Nativity of St. John the Baptist,) in full force and effect, according to the tenour and effect of this statute, any thing in the aforesaid statute of repeal to the contrary notwithstanding."

Indeed, it seems to be undeniable that the ordinal of Edward formed part and parcel of the Book of Common Prayer; in the table of contents of which appeared, as the 21st article, "The form and manner of consecrating of bishops."—In the edition of 1552, the printer's name, according to the custom of that time, is found at the end of the book, after the ordinal; which proves that it had been incorporated with the Book of Common Prayer; and that

\* Courayer, p. 121

† Ibid.

therefore the revival of the one, necessarily implied the restoration of the other. This is so true, that Courayer himself, as I shall presently show, gives up this plea as indefensible.

And this is also admitted by Mason, who, speaking of the Ordinal of Edward, says:—"Which, as at this day, so then was not esteemed *another* distinct book from the book of Common Prayer; but they were both jointly reputed as *one book*, and so established by act of Parliament. In the first of Queen Mary, by the repealing of this act, the book was disannulled, but it was *established* again in the *first* of Queen Elizabeth, and *confirmed* in the eighth, of her reign."<sup>\*</sup>—Speaking of the ordinal of Edward VI., Heylin says: "it was approved of and confirmed as a part thereof (i. e. of the Book of Common Prayer) by act of Parliament, An. 5. Edw. 6. cap. 1. and of this book it is we find mention in the 36th article of Queen Elizabeth's time, in which it is declared; that 'whosoever were consecrated, and ordered, according to the rites thereof, should be reputed and adjudged to be lawfully consecrated and rightly ordered.'"<sup>†</sup> In fact had this been the sole ground on which Bonner rested his plea, had this been the principal defect in Horn's consecration, it is not easy to conceive why Strype should assign a different motive, namely, that Parker, Horn's supposed consecrator, was not ordained by an archbishop, according to the statute of Henry VIII.,<sup>‡</sup>—while Heylin and Collier assign the one generally received, namely, that the ordinal of Edward VI. was not revived at the time;<sup>§</sup>—both

\* Mason lib. 2. c. 11. p. 91. † History of the Reformation, p. 83.

‡ Strype. annals, T. 3. c. 34. p. 312.

§ Heylin. History of the Reformation. Elizabeth, p. 173. Collier, part 2. p. 193.



which positions Courayer himself shews to be untenable, saying of the latter:—"this second is not a jot truer than the other."\* Nor would Courayer himself have been put to the trouble of *conjecturing*, that Bonner's plea was grounded on the fact, that the ordinal of Edward VI., although *actually* revived by the 1st of Elizabeth, was not a legal instrument of ordination, inasmuch as it was not revived *by name*!† His statement of the difficulty, such as he conjectured it to have been, is as follows: "By the Statute," says he, "of 1552, Edward VI. had added a form for consecrating bishops, priests and deacons, to the Book of Common Prayer, and it was from that time to make part of the said book. In 1551 this book was abolished, together with the form for the ordination of bishops. In 1559, when Queen Elizabeth caused the Statute of 1553 to be repealed, there is express mention made of the book of Common Prayer, but not of the additions that had been made to it, i. e. of the form of Ordination, because it was looked upon as a part of the said book.‡ This omission is the occasion of all the difficulty in this point; for this form having been abolished by name in Queen Mary's reign, and not re-established by name in Queen Elizabeth's, Bonner's counsel pretended that the ordination was null, and Horn was no bishop. This seemed of consequence enough to be laid before Parliament in 1556, and it occasioned the last statute that I have quoted (1556), by which the ordinations made in Queen Elizabeth's time are declared good and valid, notwithstanding any pretences to the contrary.

\* Courayer. 122.

† Compare this assertion with the words of the act just quoted (p. 40,) in which there is express mention made of the *alterations* and *additions*. ACTUON.

“The Parliament, in determining about the validity of the English ordinations, declared expressly that the form of ordination had been *re-established in 1559*. And if we consider the case seriously, they could not have determined otherwise. For by the statute of 1552, the form of ordination was made a part of the *Book of Common Prayer*.”\*

If this solution of the difficulty be ingenious, it does not appear to me at all calculated to help the cause, in support of which it is brought forward. If the ordinal of Edward was revived, in June, 1559, as is most certain, the supposed consecration of Parker in December, 1559, was *legal*; and, therefore, Bonner could not have demurred on the ground of any defect in the observance of the law; especially as in the supposed commission of the 6th of December, 1559, by virtue of which Parker is said to have been consecrated, the following clause appears:—“*SUPPLYING nevertheless by our supreme royal authority, from our mere motion and certain knowledge, if—in those things which you shall do according to our mandate, or in you, or any one of you, or your condition, state, or faculty for the accomplishment of the foregoing,—there be any thing wanting or to be wanting, of what is required or necessary in this case, by the statutes of this realm, or by the ecclesiastical laws,—the circumstance of the time, and the necessity of things so demanding it.*”† Nay more, we are told by the advocates of the Anglican ordinations, that six lawyers had given the following opinion as to the competence of the Queen so to order, and of the persons named in the commission to act under it.

“We whose names that are hereunder subscribed, think in our judgments, that by this commission in this form

\* Courayer, p. 126.

† See commission of 6th December, 1559, Rymer. XV. 549.

penned, as well the Queen's Majesty may lawfully authorize the persons within named to the effect specified, as that the said persons may exercise the act of confirming and consecrating in the same to them committed."

(Signed) WILLIAM MAX,            HENRY HARVEY,  
              ROBERT WESTON,       THOMAS YALE,  
              EDWARD LEEDS,        NICHOLAS BULLINGHAM.

Now although I believe, and will, in due time, endeavour to prove, that this commission, and certificate, as well as the Lambeth Register, in which they are referred to, were fabricated, long subsequent to the time of Parker's consecration, the defenders of the English ordinations, must admit their authority, as they are their own documents. This certificate, then, appears to me to destroy the objection, taken to the fact of Bonner's denial of the episcopal character of Horn, namely, that that demur was solely grounded on a legal informality, which, I have already shown, did not actually exist, and which, if urged at all, would have been easily over-ruled.

Besides, if such legal informality did exist, was there not sufficient time to remedy it by an act of Parliament, between the 1st of August when Parker was elected, and the December following? How could it have escaped the notice of the Queen's legal advisers? or of the six counsel at law who were consulted on the occasion? Does not this consultation show that every anxiety was manifested, in the supposition of the genuine character of that document, by all parties concerned, that no ground of objection might be afforded those who were not inattentive observers of the most important event in the history of the English Reformation,—the foundation of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy? Would the Queen's party have been *afraid*,—for this is the word used by Fuller,—to commit the determination of

so important an affair to the judgment of a jury? Would an act of Parliament have been passed, which, if not absolutely needed, was the greatest injury ever inflicted on the Anglican Church, and has given rise to that name by which the bishops of England are yet known—Parliament bishops? Would Bonner, who denied the Queen's supremacy, and who, of course, would not have denied the *validity* of an episcopal consecration in consequence of a supposed *legal* informality; would Stapleton, Saunders, Harding, Bristow, and the many other distinguished Englishmen and foreigners who, as I shall presently show, reproached the English bishops with never having received episcopal consecration; would they, or could they, have used such language without something more to sustain them than a legal defect,—supposing that such legal defect actually existed?

The truth of the matter appears pretty clearly to have been, that so notorious was the defect of episcopal consecration in the first English bishops, that a reference to a jury was regarded as a perilous experiment. And not without reason, if we can believe Dr. Heylin, who says, "it was advised that the decision of the point should rather be referred to the following parliament, for fear that such a weighty matter might miscarry by a contrary jury, of whose either partiality, or insufficiency, there had been some proofs made before, touching the grants made by King Edward's Bishops; of which a great many were made under this pretence, that the granters were not actually bishops, nor legally possessed of their several sees."<sup>1</sup>

Whatever, then, may be thought of the motive of Bonner's denial, it is certain, that, at least, previous to 1566, a formal

<sup>1</sup> Heyl. 173 4.

and public denial was made, that Horn, and, consequently, Parker, from whom he was supposed to have received consecration, were bishops; and that no lapse of time might cause this memorable plea to be forgotten, the English Parliament immediately passed the following act, by which, says Dr. Heylin, "the church is strongly settled on her natural pillars."

ACT OF 8TH ELIZABETH, 1556.

"For as much as divers questions by overmuch boldness of speech, and talk, amongst many of the common sort of people, being unlearned, hath lately grown upon the making and consecrating of Archbishops and Bishops within this realm, whether the same were and be duly and orderly done according to the law or not, which is much tending to the slander of all the state of clergy, being one of the greatest states of this realm: Therefore for the avoiding of such slanderous speech, and to the intent that every man that is willing to know the truth, may plainly understand that the same evil speech and talk, is not grounded upon any just matter or cause, it is thought convenient hereby partly to touch such authorities as do allow and approve the making and consecrating of the same Archbishops and Bishops to be duly and orderly done according to the laws of this realm, and thereupon further to provide for the more surety thereof, as hereafter shall be expressed :

"Wherefore for the plain declaration of all the premises, and to the extent that the same may the better be known to every one of the Queen's Majesties subjects, whereby such evil speech as heretofore hath been used against the high state of prelacy may hereafter cease, Be it now de-

\* Heylin, *History Reform. Eliz.* p. 174.

declared and enacted by the authority of this present parliament, That the said act and statute made in the first year of the reign of our said Sovereign Lady the Queen's Majesty, whereby the said Book of Common Prayer, and the administration of sacraments with other rites and ceremonies is authorized and allowed to be used, shall stand and remain good and perfect to all respects and purposes; and that such order and form for the consecration of Archbishops and Bishops, and for the making of priests, deacons, and ministers, as was set forth in the time of the said late King Edward VI., and added to the said Book of Common prayer, and authorized by Parliament in the fifth and sixth years of the said late king, shall stand and be in full force and effect, and shall from henceforth be used and observed in all places within this realm, and other the Queen's Majesties dominions and countries.

“ And that all acts and things heretofore had, made or done by any person or persons, in or about any consecration, confirmation, or investing of any person or persons elected to the office or dignity of any Archbishop or Bishop within this realm, or within any other the Queen's Majesties dominions or countries, by virtue of the Queen's Majesties letters, patents, or commissions sithence (since) the beginning of her Majesties reign, be and shall be by authority of this present parliament, declared, judged, and deemed, at and from every of the several times of doing thereof, good and perfect to all respects and purposes, any matter or thing that can or may be objected to the contrary thereof in any wise notwithstanding.

“ And that all persons that have been or shall be made, ordered (ordained) or consecrated Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, Ministers of God's Holy Word and Sacraments, or Deacons, after the form and order prescribed in the

said order and form how Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, Deacons, and Ministers, should be consecrated, made, and ordered (ordained,) be in very deed, and also by authority hercof, declared and enacted to be, and shall be Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, Ministers, and Deacons, and rightly made, ordered and consecrated, any statute, law, canons, or other thing to the contrary notwithstanding."

"It plainly appears by this statute," says Courayer, from the English translation of whose "defence" I have copied it, "that it was not the Parliament that gave validity to the ordinations, but supposed them valid, and acknowledged them as such, and consequently declares them such."

It need not be said that this act failed in its intended effect of silencing the overmuch boldness of speech, which it commemorates in its preamble. During the whole of Elizabeth's reign, the very important defect—which surely must have been something more than a mere legal informality,—was objected to the Anglican bishops; and even so late as 1597, we find an act passed by the Parliament of that Queen, to confirm the bishops and other dignitaries of the Established Church, in their ecclesiastical prerogatives,—“any ambiguity or question in that behalf heretofore made, or hereafter to be made, to the contrary in anywise notwithstanding.”†

Let us now pass from the acts of the English Parliament to examine what were the sentiments of the English Catholic Doctors, all of whom were the contemporaries of the first Anglican bishops, and many of whom, at first, had been zealous partizans of the new religion.

Between the years 1562, and 1568, a distinguished Catholic Divine, Dr. Harding, had a sharp controversy

† Act of 1597, in Appendix to Courayer

with the famous Jewel, Protestant bishop of Salisbury. Dr. Heylin thus sketches the character of these two celebrated men:—"The combatants (Jewel and Harding,) were born in the same country, bred up in the same grammar school, and studied in the same university also: So that it may be said of them, as the Historian hath of Jugurtha, and Sylla, under Caius Marius, that is to say, that they both learned those feats of arms in the same camp, and under the same commander, which afterwards they were to exercise against one another. Both zealous Protestants also in the time of King Edward, and both relapsed to Popery in the time of Queen Mary; Jewel for fear, and Harding upon hope of favour and preferment by it. But Jewel's fall may be compared to that of St. Peter's, which was short and sudden, rising again by his repentance, and fortified more strongly in his faith than before he was. But Harding's, like to that of the other Simon, premeditated and resolved on, never to be restored again (so much was there within him of the gall of bitterness) to his former standing."<sup>a</sup>

In 1562, Bishop Jewel published his famous "*apology for the Church of England*," to which Harding published in 1563, a reply entitled: "*Confutation of the apology of the Church of England; Antwerp, 1563.*" In this he says:—"Therefore, to go from your succession, which you cannot prove, and to come to your vocation (orders,) how say you, Sir? You bear yourself as though you were bishop of Salisbury? But how can you prove your vocation? By what authority usurp you the ministration of doctrine and sacraments? What can you allege for the right and proof of your ministry? Who hath laid hands on you? By what

<sup>a</sup> Heylin History of Eliz. p. 130.



example hath he done it? How and by whom are you consecrated? Who hath sent you? Who hath committed to you the office you take upon you? Be you a priest or be you not? If you be not, how dare you usurp the name and office of a bishop? If you be, tell us who gave you orders?"\*

The reply of Jewel is remarkable for its evasive character. Harding had asked; "by whom he was made priest,"—using the word "priest," in the more enlarged sense of bishop, who is nothing more than a priest of the first order, because endowed with the plenitude of the sacerdotal power. Taking advantage of this ambiguity, which the context, as may be seen by the concluding sentence of the above extract, sufficiently removed, Jewel answered:—"Since it pleases you" (I translate from the Latin) "to demand from me my letters of ordination; and to ask me, as if you had any authority for so doing, whether I am a priest or not; who imposed hands on me; how I have been ordained: I answer, that I was made priest long since, by the same rite and title, and, if I mistake not, by the same person and by the same hands, by which you, yourself, Harding, were made a priest, in the time of Edward VI., that excellent prince. Therefore, you cannot doubt of my priesthood, unless you call your own also into question." Harding immediately replied; he denied that Jewel was ordained priest, either at the same time, or in the same manner, or by the same hands that he, Harding, had been ordained; or, indeed, in the time of Edward VI. He then continues: "But you have not answered half my question. For I laid down this foundation from St. Jerome; There is no church, where there is no priest; for

\* Contutation, part 2, c. 5. p. 57, 58

the word "sacerdos," (priest) signifies, as you well know, not only a simple priest but a bishop. Therefore, I ask you as much about your promotion to the episcopal dignity, as to the priesthood. Suffer me, then, to recall my words once more to you. I wrote thus, and you have not yet answered; let us not now discuss your succession, which you cannot prove, and come to the investigation of your vocation (orders)."\*

Although Jewel published a third work in the same year, 1568, in which he pretended to answer Harding's book, he observed a profound silence on the important subject of his consecration. Nothing but the fact, that he could not satisfactorily explain that circumstance, can account for the insincerity displayed in the following answer which he makes to the question: "was he a bishop?" "You ask me," says he, "as if you were my Metropolitan, if I am a bishop or not. I answer; I am a bishop by the free, customary, and canonical ELECTION of the whole Chapter of Salisbury, assembled for that purpose, and of which you, Harding, were then a member; and, as I heard, were present in your own person with your brethren, and gave your free and public suffrage to that same election. If you deny that, take care lest you be found to give testimony against yourself."† Harding, in reply, denied that he was present at the election, that he had given his suffrage, or that that election had been canonical,—it having been solely caused by the dread of the King's power;—and Jewel, at length, finding all further evasion fruitless, in a

\* "Detection of sundry foul errors, lies, slanders, corruptions, uttered and practised by Mr. Jewel, in a book, lately by him set forth, called "An Answer." Louvaine, 1568.

† Jewel, 129.

subsequent work, declares, that he had been consecrated by his Archbishop, assisted by three other bishops, and had been recognized as a bishop by the Queen. To this Harding replied: "But you were made, you say, by the consecration of the Archbishop (Parker) and other three bishops. And how, I pray you, was your Archbishop himself consecrated? What three bishops were there in the realm to lay hands upon him? You have made the matter worse than I had objected it to you. Your Metropolitan, who should give authority to all your consecrations, had himself no lawful consecration. There were, indeed, some lawful bishops in the kingdom, who either were not required to impose hands on you; or who, being required, refused to do so." Jewel made no further answer to this charge. In another place, Harding, writing shortly after the famous act of 1566, says:—"If you will needs have your matters seem to depend of your Parliament, let us not be blamed if we call it a Parliament religion, Parliament Gospel, Parliament faith."\*

I have been diffuse in my extracts from this controversy, for the same two reasons as Champrey, from whom I copy, assigns for his still more prolix quotations. First, that the reader may see that the consecration of Parker was denied immediately after it is supposed to have occurred, by one every way qualified to bear testimony on the occasion;—one who was probably in England, when it is said to have taken place, and who, by reason of his temporary adherence to the protestant party, as well as by his established character for learning and sincerity, may be looked upon by all as an unsuspecting evidence;† while by the

\* Confutation of the Apology, part 6. c. 2. quoted by Mason.

† For an account of the controversy between Jewel and Harding, see Wood's *ATHENÆ OXONIENSES*. Art. Jewel.

Catholic, who venerates him as one of those who perilled all for the preservation of religion, his words will be received with the respect due to the character of a confessor of the faith. And secondly, because the final silence of Jewel, after his repeated tergiversations, is a proof, that he could not sustain the consecration of Parker, from whom he confessed, although with considerable reluctance, that he himself had received consecration.

Stapleton, another eminent English divine, who wrote at different periods between 1566 and 1573, bears the most complete testimony to the fact I am at present engaged in establishing. Speaking of the result of the proceedings against Bishop Bonner, he says that, "while they were endeavouring to force on him the oath of Supremacy, they were found to be 'MOCK BISHOPS,'—'EPISCOPI LARVATI;'"\* In his "Counterblast to Horn, pretended bishop of Winchester," he says: "To say the truth you are no lord of Winchester, nor elsewhere, but only Mr. Robert Horn. Is it not notorious, that you, and your colleagues, were not ordained according to the prescript, I will not say of the church, but even of the very statutes? How, then, can you challenge for yourself the name of the Lord bishop of Winchester." And again: "You are without any consecration of your metropolitan (Parker), himself, poor man, being no bishop neither."† In his answer to Jewel's book, entitled "A Reply," he says: "How chanced, then, Mr. Jewel, that you and your fellows, bearing yourselves for bishops, have not so much as this congruity and consent, I will not say of the Pope, but of any Christian bishops at all, throughout all Christendom; neither are you

\* Answer to Horn c. 5. I quote from the Latin.

† Counterblast to Horn, p. 301.

liked and allowed by any one of them all; but have taken upon you that office, WITHOUT ANY IMPOSITION OF HANDS, without all ecclesiastical authority, without all order of canons and right? I ask not who gave you bishoprics, but who made you bishops?"\* In another place, quoted by Courayer, he says to Horn:—"For although he might style you bishop of Winchester, yet I am in the right to declare that you are neither a bishop, nor the bishop of Winchester."†

In his Homily on the festival of St. Mark, the same profound theologian says: "No one is lawfully sent, unless he be sent by the bishop through the imposition of hands. The heretics of our time want this mission, for they are sent by no bishops. Although with the Lutherans and Calvinists some are sent by the imposition of hands still, because the first teachers were not sent by any one, all this imaginary mission is a 'mere farce' (*merum nugamentum*).—Such are all who in England are called bishops, who, when the real bishops were ejected, with one exception, by the Queen's power,—succeeding no one, but beginning from themselves, they *received from no one the imposition of hands*, not even from the Germans or the French, or the pastors of any of these so-called Reformed Churches."‡ In his 'controversies,' which even now-days are highly esteemed, he says of the English bishops, "that whereas they, at first, seized on the episcopal sees, solely by the royal power,—*sola regia autoritate*—they now absurdly (*ridicule*,) ordain their ministers by the imposition of hands."§ Now, I put it to the candor of the reader to say, whether Stapleton could have thus

\* Challenge to Jewel and Horn

j Courayer, p. 121.

‡ Tom. 4. pa. 851

§ Quæst. 4. art. 4.

written, had Parker been consecrated by any one having even a colourable title to the episcopal character?

Nicholas Sanders is the next witness I shall produce. The change of religion under Elizabeth, found him Regius Professor of Canon Law in the university of Oxford; and being unwilling to sacrifice his conscience to his worldly interests, he retired to Rome, where he was raised to the Priesthood. He accompanied Cardinal Hosius as theologian to the Council of Trent, and was subsequently made professor of theology in Louvain. He died in 1583. He was the author of several theological works, as also of a History of the English Schism, which yet continues to be deservedly esteemed. In this he says, when speaking of the first English bishops:—"For being destitute of all lawful ordination, when they were commonly said and proved by the laws of England to be no bishops, they were constrained to crave the assistance of the secular power, that they might receive the consecration of the lay Magistrate in the next Parliament; by authority whereof if any thing were done amiss, and not according to the prescript of the law, or omitted and left undone in the former inauguration, it might be pardoned them; and that after they had enjoyed the episcopal office and chair many years, *without any episcopal consecration.*"\* He elsewhere calls them "*Reginales Prælati*," or 'Queen's prelates,'† Speaking of Parker, he styles him: "Master Dr. Parker, bearing the name of the archbishop of Canterbury."‡

Bristow, another distinguished Catholic divine, who died in 1582, says:—"In England, the King, yea, the Queen, may give their letters patent to whom they will, and they

\* Sanders. l. 3. p. 298. quoted by Mason.

† lib. 3. p. 297.

‡ Sanders Rock of the Church, Louvain, 1569, quoted by Mason.

thence forward may bear themselves for bishops, and may begin to ordain ministers.”\* Elsewhere, he says of Parker, Grindall, and others, who had formerly been made priests by the Catholic rite,—*Idonei visi sunt, qui sine ordinatione nova non solum presbyteri essent, sed et episcopi et archiepiscopi et primates*,—“they were deemed, without a new ordination, to be not only priests, but even bishops, and archbishops, either by virtue of the royal letters, or by a certain ridiculous consecration of those who had received no power to consecrate except what the Queen had given them.”

And again: “Consider,” says he, “what church that is whose ministers are but very laymen, unsent, uncalled, unconsecrated, holding therefore among us, when they repent and return, no other place but of laymen; in no case admitted, nor looking to minister any office, unless they take orders, which before they had not.”—“There is no herdsman in all Turkey,” says Mr. Rainolds—who having been chaplain to bishop Jewel, and discovering the unblushing falsehood of his appeals to antiquity, renounced protestantism, and embraced catholicism;—“There is no herdsman in all Turkey, who hath not undertaken the government of his herd upon better reason and greater right, order and authority, than these your magnificent apostles and evangelists can shew for this divine and high office of governing souls.”† Weston says of the same supposed prelates,—*non ritu aliquo sacro aut episcopali actione*,—*by no sacred rite, or episcopal act*. So notorious, indeed, appears to have been the fact, that the

\* Motives, t. 2, 261. quoted by Mason.

† *Calvino-Turcismo*, lib. 1. c. 15. p. 975.

first protestant bishops were not consecrated, that it is said, in the writings of Osorius, a celebrated bishop in Portugal, who died in 1580, and whose works were published in Rome in 1592, that they were not consecrated by *any ceremony*,—*sine ulla cerimonia consecrati*.

In the supplication addressed by the Catholic Priests to James I., in 1604, they expressly state ; “ Neither is any of your protestant ministers coming to our Catholic fraternity, reputed other than merely laymen without orders.”<sup>†</sup>

To shew that I have not misstated the opinions of the distinguished Catholic theologians whom I have quoted, and of others, such as Bellarmine, Gregory de Valentia etc, whom I might have added to their number, I shall conclude this part of the evidence in the words of the great advocate of the Anglican Ordinations, Courayer, who says :— “ I know that Stapleton, Harding, and other Catholic writers contemporary with Parker, have affirmed to the face of the new bishops, that they were not true bishops, that their consecration was a chimera, and that they could not prove their ordination ; having received it from a man, whose ordination was equally unsustainable.”<sup>†</sup>

The last witness I shall produce, to establish the fact which is the subject of this chapter, namely, that before the appearance of Mason’s book in 1613, it was constantly and publicly denied that the bishops and other clergy of the English Church were validly ordained, is no other than Mr. Mason himself. The very title of his work, promises to clear the bishops of the Church of England “ from the slanders and odious imputations of Bellarmine,

<sup>†</sup> See Mason.      † Courayer, 255.



Sanders, Bristow, Harding, Allen, Stapleton, Parsons, Kellison, Eudemon, Becanus and other Romanists." In the "Epistle Dedicatorie," to Archbishop Abbot, Mason, after speaking of what the Act of 1566 calls the "overmuch boldness of speech" on the English orders, says:—"Whereupon I wished, from the bottom of my heart, that some learned men would have vouchsafed for the glory of God, and the good of the Church, to scatter those popish mists, and to set the truth in a clearer light." Hence, it is evident that, although fifty years had passed away, during which the Protestant bishops were publicly and repeatedly upbraided with the invalidity of their orders, as yet no one had appeared to vindicate them,—at least to Mason's satisfaction,—from the slanders and odious imputations cast on them by the writers mentioned above, who were no insignificant characters, but most of them, in the foremost rank of literature and divinity. Nay more, it is evident from the following passage, which occurs a little further on, in the same dedication, that many Protestants had returned to the Catholic church, in consequence of this most extraordinary silence of their clergy. "If any," continues Mason, "have formerly made scruple to enter our orders, out of ignorance how the odious and scandalous imputations, blazed in Popish bookes, might be truly answered, and the point cleared by record," (oh that mysterious record! which now, for the first time, was publicly referred to.) . . . "And if any upon this surmise bee fallen away to our adversaries, who knoweth what effect God may worke in them, when they shall plainly see how they have been deluded with Popish stratagems." Whether Mason suc-

ceeded in realizing his wishes or not, will be seen by the subsequent part of this work. It is, however, certain, that contrary to the natural course of things, what he called "odious slanders" two hundred and twenty-eight years ago, instead of being "silenced," have ever since been, and still continue, the subject of discussion.

From all these testimonies, it is evident that from a very short time after the time of the supposed consecration of Parker, in 1559, it was publicly and repeatedly denied, that the first bishops of the Anglican church were consecrated; and although this denial was urged in the most pointed terms, in controversies with some of these bishops, such as Jewel and Horn, the only answer to them that we can discover in their writings, are shuffling evasions or coarse ridicule of the form of ordination among the Catholics. Thus, for instance, Whitaker, who wrote during the reign of Elizabeth, says, in reply to the objections of the Catholic doctors: "I would not have you to think that we make such reckoning of your orders, as to hold our own vocation unlawful without them."————

"You are highly deceived," writes Fulke, "if you think we esteem your offices of bishops, priests, and deacons, better than laymen." And in his "Retentive," he says: "With all our hearts, we defy, abhor, detest, and spit at your stinking, greasy, and anti-christian orders."\*

The plea publicly set up by Bonner, that Horne was not a bishop; the testimonies of several learned and holy men, who were in England at the time, and would have known of any public consecration, had it taken place; and the silence of Jewel, Horn, and indeed of all Protest-

\* Quoted by Ward.

ants at the time, and for several years after,—all these **FACTS** establish, beyond the possibility of doubt, that the consecration of the first Protestant bishops was denied,—publicly and repeatedly,—in the reign of Elizabeth, that is, a few years after it is said to have taken place.

## CHAPTER IV.

General observations on the principles followed in examining the account of Parker's consecration.

IN the preceding chapters I have established two important facts; first, that the rite of consecration was held in little estimation by the first English Reformers; and second, that the ordinations of the English Church were repeatedly and publicly called in question or denied, during the reign of Elizabeth. I have shown that this denial was not made so much on the ground of any defect, legal or canonical, which, however it might render the ordinations irregular and illegal, could not make them invalid; but because the first bishops of that church were said to have been inducted into their respective sees, solely by the Royal authority, and without any ceremony of consecration. I now come to the examination of two alleged consecrations of Matthew Parker. One of these is said to have taken place at the Nag's-head tavern in Cheapside, London; and this, of course, has been indignantly denied by the Anglicans, at least, since the year 1613,—the date of Mason's book, referred to in the preceding chapter. The other consecration, on which they rely, is said to have been in the chapel attached to the Archbishop of Canterbury's palace, at Lambeth, on the 17th of December, 1559: and this is denied by most Catholics as a fabrication, the falsehood

of which, they say, is evinced by many arguments, while the fact is regarded by some others as sufficiently established by historical evidence.

In the supposition that Parker was actually consecrated at Lambeth, Catholic writers have uniformly denied such consecration to have been valid,—both because, as they say, Barlow, the supposed consecrator of Parker, had himself never received episcopal consecration ; as well as on account of the insufficiency of the form which he is said to have used. Both these latter questions will form the subject of distinct chapters. I shall, for the present, confine myself to the examination of the fact of Parker's consecration.

In the investigation of these alleged consecrations, considerable difficulty must necessarily be found ; for the authenticity of the documents by which the Lambeth-consecration is sought to be established, is denied by most Catholic writers, and has been denied from the first public reference made to them in 1613. Many royal acts are also produced which are scarcely reconcileable with other royal acts acknowledged by both parties ; and still less conformable to registers, which, belonging either to private persons, or ecclesiastical corporations, are mainly relied on, for the establishment of Parker's consecration.

In this conflict of opposite authorities, it would be impossible to arrive at the truth, unless we could discover some certain criterion by which spurious, may be distinguished from genuine, records ; and by the application of which, without reference to any particular system, we may at once be enabled to reject whatever is not of a certain character, and have our confidence strengthened in those whose authenticity is established beyond all reasonable doubt by such a test. It is, then, my present design to

point out the principles which have guided me in this inquiry.

1. With regard to Royal commissions, which are the most important documents we have to examine, I consider as a certain test of authenticity, the words ‘*Per Breve de privato sigillo*’—(“By a warrant under the privy seal,”) or “*Per ipsum Regem,*” or *Per ipsam Reginam* (“By the King himself,” or “by the Queen herself”);—appended to them in the collection of public documents, known as the *Foedera* of Rymer. To understand the nature and force of this test, it must be observed, that Rymer, when he set about making his collection, found that his materials,—the public Records,—consisted of two sorts; those which had the seal, public or private, of the power from which such documents emanated; and those which had no such attestation of their genuine character. These latter appeared to be Royal acts; but had nothing to authenticate them; and they would not be received as evidence in a court of justice, on account of this defect. Now Rymer has inserted *all* the documents he found; but has, at the same time, given his readers the same clew to guide them in their judgment of the character of each that he himself had. He marked those which had the Royal seal, or other unquestionable sign of being a Royal act, by these or similar words: *Per Breve de privato sigillo,*” or “*Per ipsam Reginam;*” while he inserted the rest without any such mark of their authenticity, leaving it thereby to be understood that they were documents, which were not authenticated by the Royal seal. Whatever Royal acts are found in Rymer, marked either *Per Breve de Privato Sigillo,* or *Per ipsum Regem,*—I have admitted as genuine; whatever other documents are found in his collection, which purport to be

Royal acts, but have not this warrant of their authenticity, I have rejected as spurious ; at least I have not admitted them as evidence, especially when they are, as is sometimes the case, contradicted by other acts, the authenticity of which is undeniable.

Now if any one deem this mark of authenticity unnecessary, and resolve to receive all the public documents in the collection of Rymer, as equally genuine, on the ground that such documents are not liable to be forged, falsified, or interpolated, I beg to direct his attention to the following clause in a general pardon, granted by King James I. of England, in the first year of his reign. This royal act proves, beyond the possibility of doubt, that public documents are, at least, liable to falsification ; and it supplies sufficient evidence that they were frequently forged and interpolated, in the reign of his immediate predecessor. "We also pardon, remit, and release by these presents to the aforesaid A. B., all and every offences and transgressions by crasing, and interlining of any rolls, records, briefs, warrants, recognitions, or other documents of ours, or of any of our predecessors or progenitors whatsoever, in any court or courts of ours, or of any of our predecessors, or our progenitors, done or perpetrated before the aforesaid 20th day of March."\* If this does not prove the *possibility*, and imply the frequency, of such crimes, I must confess I know not what would.

2. I have taken not only these Royal acts, but also all other records, and extracts from authors, just as I find them, interpreting them according to the established rules of interpreting official documents ; neither supposing errors

\* Rymer xvi. p. 534.

on the part of those who composed them, nor supplying supposed defects, nor, by unnatural and forced interpretations, endeavoring to find in their words that meaning, and that meaning alone, which best accords with my views. Thus, for example, it is an established rule to speak of a clergyman promoted to an episcopal see, but not yet consecrated, as a bishop *elect*: also when a bishop is transferred from one see to another, usage requires that in speaking of him, after his translation, and *before* his canonical installation into the new see, he be named in public documents as formerly bishop of N., now bishop elect of M. Hence I infer that when, in a public document, there is only question of a bishop *elect*, that this bishop *elect*, was never in possession of a former see, and therefore must be regarded as not yet consecrated.

3. Ever since the appearance of Mason's work in 1613, in defence of the English ordinations, all protestant writers, —theologians, historians, etc., have repeated his assertion that Parker was consecrated at Lambeth, on the 17th of December, 1559. I have, therefore, rejected all attestations from authors of a date posterior to the year in which Mason wrote, 1613;—and all editions of works printed after that year, in the preceding editions of which, if such there were, such evidence is not found, or can be now ascertained by credible witnesses not to have been found, when these first editions are no longer extant or accessible to me. The reason of this rule is obvious; Protestant writers may have been unduly influenced by the authority of Mason,—and indeed, they have uniformly followed in his steps in this controversy, or they may have been influenced by the interests of their sect: and the publishers of new editions of works, first published



## ANGELICAN ORDINATIONS.

before the appearance of Mason's Defence, may have thought themselves justified in supplying what they regarded as a serious defect.

These rules are evidently reasonable, and the application of them will prevent much perplexing discussion, that, otherwise, would be inevitable.

## CHAPTER V.

Commission of 9th of September, 1559.

THE See of Canterbury became vacant on the 17th of November, 1558, by the death of the great and good Cardinal Pole, than whom, among those not held up to the veneration of the faithful, ecclesiastical history records no more worthy person. On the 18th of July, in the following year, a writ authorizing the election of Matthew Parker, was issued; and on the 1st of the following August, he was elected to succeed the late archbishop. On the 9th of September, the Queen issued her commission, for the legal confirmation and consecration of the newly elect. This commission begins in these words :

Elizabetha, Dei gratia Angliæ etc  
Reverendis in Christo Patribus,  
Cuthberto episcopo Dunelmensi,  
Gilberto Bathoniensi episcopo,  
David episcopo Burgi Sancti Petri  
Antonio Landavensi episcopo.  
Wilielmo Barlo episcopo, et  
Johanni Seory, episcopo, Salutem.

(Elizabeth by the Grace of God, etc., To the Reverend Fathers in Christ—Cuthbert, bishop of Durham. Gilbert. bishop of Bath. David, bishop of Peterborough.

Anthony, bishop of Landaff, William Barlow, BISHOP, and John Scory, BISHOP, Health.)

With regard to this document it is to be premised,

1st. That it does not seem to have been known to, as it is not mentioned by, Mason, who cites a commission of a later date, which is directed to four other persons, in addition to the three *last* named in this commission. This commission was first referred to by Dr. Bramhall, bishop of Derry, in his work on the present subject.\*

2nd. That although Ward endeavours to throw suspicion on it, because directed to three Catholic bishops, who, according to Stowe, were deprived of their Sees before this time, in consequence of refusing to take the Oath of Supremacy,—yet its authenticity must be regarded as certain: as this commission has the mark of authenticity before referred to, being, “*Per Breve de privato sigillo,*” and must, therefore, be considered as authentic. Nor is the authority of Stowe opposed to it; because although he states that the Catholic bishops were deprived at an earlier date, there are reasons to believe that his words must be taken with some limitation; and that Elizabeth, who was most anxious that Parker should be duly consecrated, left as many in possession of their sees, as might be required for the ceremony. She, no doubt, may have cherished the hope that the example of severity she had exercised towards the prelates already deposed, would not be without its effect in overcoming whatever religious scruples those she had yet spared, might have to comply with her orders. This is not a vain surmise, but a fact, supported by the authority of Larre, a French Huguenot historian, who, in his life of Elizabeth, expressly states, that the prelates named in the commission, were left in their sees;

\* “Consecration and Succession of Protestant bishops justified.”

—“probably,” says he, “they were permitted to retain them, in the hope that they would consecrate Parker, as was so much desired. They, however, refused to comply with the wishes of the court. This disobedience, combined with what had before occurred, caused them to be deposed shortly afterwards.”\* The same is also testified by Dr. Bramhall, who attributes the deprivation of three of them, which took place shortly afterwards, to their refusal to consecrate Parker.†

It has been before observed, that Mason, who first publicly appealed to the Lambeth-Register, makes no mention whatever of this commission, but refers to one, dated the 6th of December following. This probably made Ward regard the Act of September, quoted by Bramhall, as suspicious, and designed to prop up that of the 6th of December: whereas, as I shall show in a proper place, it furnishes a strong proof of the spurious character of this latter document.

A statute of Henry VIII. required four bishops to assist at a consecration, and accordingly we find four bishops, of whose consecration there could be no doubt, named first in the commission. With them are joined Barlow and Seory, who are merely styled bishops, and have not, like the rest, the name of any see connected with their names; and it appears by the testimony of John Stowe, that they both were then merely bishops elect. Describing the services, performed in London, on the death of Henry II. of France, he thus mentions the officiating prelates:—“Dr. Parker, Archbishoppe of Cantorburie elect, Doctor Barlow, Bishoppe of Chichester elect, Doctor Seory,

\* Larre's Hist. de Eliz. p. 21, (cited by Harduin.)

† Bram. p. 85

Bishoppe of Hereford, elect."\* The only reason why they were named in this commission seems to have been, that they might be authentic witnesses of the consecration of the new primate, who was to be for the Anglican Church, the foundation of its hierarchy.

By another statute of Henry VIII., the prelates named in such a commission as this, who should refuse or defer to consecrate within *twenty days*, from the issuing of the order, subjected themselves to a *premunire*. This regulation was intended to prevent the possibility of recurring to Rome, in the interval between the time of nomination and consecration. The bishops of Durham, Bath, and Peterborough refused, and were consequently deprived. The bishop of Landaff did not consecrate, as is agreed on by all. He was not deprived; probably because, for the reasons to be mentioned in the next chapter, Parker did not deem it prudent to urge matters against him; and probably, because his obsequiousness in taking the oath of Supremacy,—in which he was the only recreant of his order,—shielded him from the rigorous execution of the law.

Although it be certain, that none of the four Catholic bishops, named in this commission, consecrated Parker; and although it is not pretended that Barlow consecrated him before the 17th of December, 1559, we yet find Parker and others, whom he is said to have consecrated, named bishops, not *elect*, but with the titles of their respective sees, (from which we may infer that they were regarded as consecrated,) in an authentic commission of the Queen,—*Per ipsam Reginam*,—on the 20th of October, just two months before the time of the supposed consecration by Barlow! This commission begins thus :

\* Annals, p. 1803. Ed. 1577. The edition of 1615 has Chester, instead of "Chichester." See Harduin, t. 1. p. 403.

Regina  
 Reverendissimo in Christo Patri, Matheo  
 Cantuariensi Archiepiscopo ; et  
 Reverendis in Christo Patribus,  
 Edmundo Londinensi episcopo, ac  
 Ricardo Eliensi episcopo,  
 Ac etiam dilectis et fidelibus consiliariis.

(The Queen to the Most Reverend Father in Christ, Mathew, Archbishop of Canterbury ; and to the Reverend Fathers in Christ, Edmond bishop of London, and Richard, bishop of Ely ; and also to our beloved and trusty counselors,) etc.

The authenticity of this commission is undeniable ; for although it is opposed to a commission subsequently said to be issued on the 6th of December, this latter, as given by Rymer, has not any warrant of authority ; it being neither *Per breve de privato sigillo*, nor *Per ipsam Reginam*, either of which, as before stated, (p. 63,) indicates authentic acts of the crown in Rymer's collection. Had we two contradictory commissions of equally authentic form, we might hesitate which to prefer : but when we have two, one of which is accompanied with a *certain* mark of its authenticity, of which the other is destitute, we cannot doubt for a moment which of the two we should regard as authentic ; unless, indeed, we permit our judgment to be swayed more by the interest we have at stake than by the rules of judicial evidence.

The date of this commission, and its authenticity being acknowledged, the only way of eluding the testimony it affords that Parker, Grindal, and Cox, were then considered to be bishops, is, that this word "bishop" is taken in a vague sense, and only indicates "bishops elect." This plea is inadmissible. Firstly, because such an assumption is con-

trary to the general rule for interpreting official documents before laid down (p. 64,) and, if once admitted, would render nugatory all arguments derived from the language of documentary evidence. Bishops elect are styled such until they are consecrated; and do not receive the absolute title of the sees for which they have been elected, until they are in *actual* possession of them. Hence Parker is called “Archbishop ELECT of Canterbury” in the commission of the 9th of September; but absolutely “ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY” on the 20th of October. This difference can alone be explained, either by saying that, in the meantime, he had been consecrated; or that the Queen believed her orders in this respect to have been complied with; or—what is most probable,—that she was forced by necessity to acknowledge him as Archbishop, although he had received no episcopal consecration. This will not appear wonderful to those who remember what were the principles of the Reformers on the *necessity* of consecration; and that Archbishop Cranmer had solemnly declared, that *election* (the royal authority) *alone* sufficed to make bishops. Secondly, The object of the commission proves that Parker, and the other bishops named in it, were considered as bishops, or at least were *to be* considered as such. In the famous case of Bishop Bonner, we have seen that none but a bishop could validly tender the oath of *supremacy* to a bishop, in his purely spiritual character. And as the commission of the 20th of October, was issued to empower the persons therein named, to present the said oath to all persons, ecclesiastical or lay, within their respective jurisdictions; it follows that Parker, Grindall, and Coxe, must have been then regarded as bishops. Whatever consecration, therefore, they received, must have been between the 9th of September, 1559, and the 20th of

the following October. Now the defenders of the Anglican ordinations make no attempt to prove that they were consecrated within this time; indeed, they endeavour to establish the fact of their consecration, at a later date. Thirdly, the title of "Most Reverend Father in Christ," given to Parker, and that of "Reverend Fathers in Christ," supposes them to have been consecrated, or regarded as consecrated; otherwise it could not have been applied to them, in an official document, without departing from the received custom of speech. Fourthly, We learn from Hollinshead, that one of the deprived bishops, (Tunstal, of Durham,) lived with Parker, at Lambeth, where he died, on the 18th of November, 1559.\* Now, the Archbishop of Canterbury cannot take possession of Lambeth palace, until he has been installed in his see, and, consequently, subsequently to his consecration. This circumstance is well calculated to strengthen the inference deduced from the language of the act of the 20th October, 1559.

All admit that this commission of 9th Sept. was not executed by any of the four principal prelates to whom it was addressed; and it may not be unimportant for the object of the present examination to inquire into the probable causes of such a refusal on their parts.

"Now if any man," says Dr. Bramhall, "desire a reason why this first commission was not executed, the best account I can give him is this, that it was directed to six

\* "He" (Tunstal) "was, by the noble Queen Elizabeth deprived of his bishopric, etc., and was committed to Matthew Parker, bishop of Canterbury, who used him very favourably, both for the gravity, learning, and age of the said Tunstal: But he not long remaining under the ward of the said bishop, did shortly after, the 18th of Nov., in the year 1559, depart this life at Lambeth." Hollinshead, quoted by Ward.



bishops, without an '*Ad minus*'—or 'at least four of you ;' so as if any one of the six were sick, or absent, or refused, the rest could not proceed to confirm or consecrate. And that some did refuse, I am very apt to believe, because three of them, not long after, were deprived."\*

This solution of the difficulty does not appear to be satisfactory. In the supposed commission of the 6th of December, seven prelates are named ; four, or at most five, of whom are alone stated to have been present at the consecration. It is true that in this latter document the clause "*Ad minus*" is found ; but the omission of such a formality cannot be supposed to have had any effect. Besides, it is absurd to imagine that in this transaction,—the accomplishment of which the Queen had so much at heart,—the persons named in the commission, were afraid lest Her Majesty's law officers might be watching their every action, ready to pounce upon them, and bring them before the courts of law for the violation of a principle, which does not appear to have been admitted or established. This reason is, therefore, nugatory. Why, then, I ask, was not this commission executed ?

"Why the consecration was deferred so long," says Dr. Heylin, "may be made a question ; some think it was, that the Queen might satisfy herself, by putting the church into a posture by her visitation, before she passed it over to the care of the bishops ; others conceive, that she was so enamoured with the title and power of Supreme Governess, that she could not deny herself that contentment in the exercise of it which the present interval afforded."†

\* Dr. Bramhall, p. 85, quoted by Ward.

† Heylin himself supposes the delay to have been caused by the desire to enjoy the revenues of the vacant sees. History of Queen

• That the four Catholic bishops, named in *this commission*, refused to execute it, is admitted by all. But we find that Landaff, who is here put the fourth, stands first in the supposed commission of the 6th of December. Hence it may be asked: why issue a new commission to him, when from his prior refusal, all parties concerned must have known that he would not execute it? If there were any legal difficulty in the way, could not that have been remedied by an Act of Parliament, between the months of September and December,—not to say any thing of the exercise of the royal prerogative? Surely there was sufficient time, between the 9th of September, and the 6th of the following December, for discovering and remedying any civil informality in the proceeding; especially as we are told by Mason that six lawyers were consulted, whose names are given, and who declared their opinion both that the Queen might lawfully authorize the persons to the effect specified; and the said persons also might lawfully exercise the right of confirming and consecrating in the same to them committed.” This testimony, and the names of the six lawyers, I have already given in the third chapter.\*

If it was not likely that Landaff would consecrate Parker, why name him in a commission, the authority of which, he was more or less likely to bring into contempt, by not executing it in such important circumstances? The only answer to these questions is, that the commission of the 6th of December,—which, moreover, has not either of the marks of authenticity established in the fourth chapter,†

Elizabeth, p. 120. Ed. 1661. Courayer, with unwonted candour, assigns the true cause—the difficulty of finding suitable consecrators. p. 27.

\* See page 44.

† Page 63.

—is incompatible with the commission of the 9th of September, and therefore is to be rejected. This conclusion, however, I shall establish more at large, and on other grounds, in a subsequent chapter.

That the Queen was most anxious for Parker's consecration, is admitted by all. Indeed, as has been already shown, it appears almost certain, that were it not for her, the first English Reformers would have dispensed altogether with the rite. All likewise admit that the execution of the Queen's will in this respect was attended with no little difficulty. The consecrations of Edward's reign had been declared invalid in that of her immediate predecessor; and Elizabeth knew that the Catholic bishops would be very unlikely to yield to her wishes in this respect, as they were—with one unfortunate exception, Kitchin of Landaff, —unanimously opposed to the new doctrine; and were prepared to suffer all extremes, rather than acknowledge her spiritual supremacy.

It was stated by Catholic writers, even before the appearance of Mason's book,—who inserts the assertion without denying it,—“that the Most Rev. Dr. Creagh, Catholic Archbishop of Armagh, who was then a prisoner in the tower of London, was applied to by Parker, with the hope of receiving from him episcopal consecration. This, however, the venerable prelate firmly refused.”<sup>+</sup>

\* Mason, p. 121.—Nullity of the Prelatic Clergy, p. 66.—Champney, 198.

## CHAPTER VI.

General observations on the story of the Nag's-head consecration.

THIS celebrated event is indignantly rejected as an odious slander by the defenders of Anglican orders, while by several distinguished Catholic divines, for, *at least*, upwards of two centuries, it has been regarded as a fact, the certainty of which is sustained by stubborn evidence.\* Before entering into an examination of the respective merits of each opinion, I shall premise a few observations, for the better understanding of the object I have in view in this chapter.

1. I do not undertake to establish the truth of the Nag's-head consecration; but merely to examine whether it be so entirely destitute of probability or proof, as has been pretended; and whether the vindicators of Catholic faith who publicly avowed their belief in its reality, at a period when they had better opportunities of ascertaining the truth than we now can possibly be supposed to have,—were imposed on by an absurd tale. Hence, if the Nag's-head consecration be disproved, the only consequence to be inferred is, that these latter were mistaken; it by no means follows that Parker was consecrated, which is a fact to be proved—like all other facts—by positive evidence; and is not established, by the confutation of the extraordinary event that forms the subject of this inquiry.

\* Huscubeth, *Faberism Exposed*, p. 529.

2. In judging of this event, we must not form our opinion by the same rules that would guide us, were there a question of the narrative of a similar event asserted to have occurred in our own times. We might,—nay, should,—naturally say to ourselves: is it possible that Protestant clergymen, who set so high a value on orders, and many of whom are probably more to be pitied for their ignorance of the truth, than to be suspected of a disposition to trifle with sacred things;—is it possible that such men would have been guilty of so impious a profanation? But we must remember that we have not to judge of our contemporaries, but of Parker, and his compeers, who publicly avowed their disbelief in the efficacy of the imposition of hands;\* and who, by the violation of their solemn vows to God, by their duplicity, and the total want of principle which appears in their whole conduct, have shown that they were capable of even still more serious profanations than that laid to their charge. It may not be out of place to remind the reader that Luther himself, although a simple priest, attempted to make Amsdorf a bishop; and that he has left on record, his opinion, that a sacrament administered *in jest* is equally valid with that conferred with the customary solemnities.

3. It must also be borne in mind, that the manners of people now-a-days are not precisely the same as they were two hundred and eighty years ago—the period of Parker's supposed consecration. Hence, although a “*tavern*” or hotel might appear to us an unsuitable place even for an ordinary meeting of such important characters, we must remember that even at the present day, meetings of the most distinguished personages, lay and clerical, are held in some

\* See Chapter II

of the London taverns. Who has not heard of the "Crown and Anchor tavern" of that city? But on this subject it is not necessary to insist, as we have the acknowledgement of those very Protestant writers who have rejected the story of the Nag's-head consecration, that a meeting of the prelates *was* held there, and that this meeting gave rise to the belief, or, at least, to the rumour, that they had been consecrated there. When Fuller wrote his Church History, the Nag's-head tavern was yet to be seen in Cheapside: and at the entrance to it, he informs us, was to be seen a mock pulpit, or something having the appearance of one.<sup>\*</sup> Fuller, indeed, denies that Parker was consecrated there, but he lets out enough to show that, whatever may have been the real nature of the meeting of the prelates at the Nag's-head, it is most unjust to regard the story as entirely unfounded, and as an absurd fiction invented through hate of Protestantism. His words are:—"Now though we are not to gratifie our adversaries with any advantages against us, yet so confident is our innocence herein, that I may acquaint the world with the small *foundation*, on which the whole *report* was *bottomed*. Every archbishop or bishop presents himself in *Bow Church*, accompanied thither with *civilians*, where any shall be heard who can make any legall exceptions, against his election. A dinner was provided for them at the Nag's-head in Cheapside, as convenient for the vicinity thereof, and from this *sparke*, hath all this fire been kindled; to admonish posterity not only to do no evil, but also, in this captious age, to refrain from *all appearance* thereof." In the margin, he says:—"This the Lord Chancellor Egerton affirmed to Bishop Williams."<sup>†</sup> Mr. Heylin repeats the same thing, almost in the

\* Fuller. Book IX. p. 61.

† Ib. p. 62.

same language :—" But to proceed," says he, " unto the consecration of the new Archbishop ; the first thing to be done after the passing of the royal assent for ratifying of the election of the dean and chapter, was the confirming of it in the court of Arches, according to the usual form in that behalf : which being accordingly performed, the Vicar General, the dean of the Arches, the proctors and officers of the court, whose presence was required at this solemnity, were entertained at a dinner provided for them at the Nag's-head in Cheapside ; for which though Parker paid the shot, (that is, the reckoning,) yet shall the Church be called to an after-reckoning." The doctor then gives a minute account of the supposed consecration of the 17th of December, after which he says, that after the ceremony " there was a plentiful dinner for the entertainment of the company which resorted thither. Amongst whom (Charles Howard (eldest son of William Lord Effingham, created afterwards Lord Admiral, and Earl of Nottingham,) happened to be one, and after testified to the truth of all these particulars, when the reality and form of this consecration was called in question by some captious sticklers for the Church of Rome.

" For so it was, that some sticklers for the Church of Rome, having been told of the dinner which was made at the Nag's-head tavern, at such times as the election of the new Archbishop was confirmed in the Arches, raised a report that the Nag's-head tavern was the place of consecration. And this report was countenanced by another slander, causing it to be noised abroad, and published in some seditious pamphlets, that the persons designed by the Queen, for several bishoprics, being met at a tavern, did then and there lay hands on one another without form or order."\*

\* History of Queen Elizabeth, p. 121, 122.

. We may here remark the important fact, which this last extract from Heylin lets out; namely, that the Nag's-head consecration, instead of being first published fifty years after the event, as Protestant writers maintain, was noised abroad and published in some seditious pamphlets soon after the fact occurred. If it was not thought of until fifty years afterwards, how could Parker's dinner at Cheapside have been, as it confessedly was, the "small foundation of the story?"

4. The circumstances in which this event is said to have occurred must be remembered. In the course of less than thirty years, the English nation had passed through four different changes of religion,—under Henry, Edward, Mary and Elizabeth. Of all the bishops which this last mentioned princess found on her ascending the throne, one only—Anthony Kitchin, bishop of Landaff—called by the Protestant Camden, "the calamity of his see,"—proved faithless, and he only did as much as might enable him to keep his see, and no more: he took the oath of supremacy; but was otherwise Catholic in his belief. Of the inferior clergy, we may form an equally favourable judgment, for although many of them retained their livings, at the sacrifice of their convictions, the defection was by no means so general, as it had been in the reign of Henry VIII. On this subject, the testimony of Dr. Heylin is unexceptionable. "Partly by the deprivation of these few persons (fourteen Bishops, six Abbots, Priors, and Governors of Religious Orders, twelve Deans and as many Archdeacons, fifteen Presidents or Masters of colleges, fifty prebendaries of cathedral churches, and about eighty parsons or vicars,)—but principally by the death of so many in the last years sickness, there was not a sufficient number of men to supply the cures, which filled the Church with an



ignorant and illiterate clergy, whose learning went no farther than the Liturgy, or the the book of Homilies, but otherwise conformable (which was no small felicity) to the rules of the Church. And on the other side, many were raised to great preferments,—who having spent their time of exile in such foreign churches as followed the platform of Geneva, returned so disaffected to Episcopal Government, unto the rites and ceremonies here by law established, as not long after filled the Church with most sad disorders.”\* When all things were in this state of confusion; when the very worst and most degraded characters of society, had been intruded into the pulpits, which the learned and orthodox clergy of the English Church were no longer permitted to occupy; can we be surprised at the ‘hole and corner’ character of a consecration which three Catholic bishops absolutely refused to perform; and which Kitchin—who, although he had sworn to the Queen’s supremacy, was in other respects a Catholic,—might be ashamed to perform in public,—the bishop elect being notorious for his heterodox tenets. When such was the

\* Heylin, p. 115. 1559.

In the conclusion of his history, Heylin inserts an address to Bishop Jewel, by one John Rastel, a fugitive priest, in which, says Dr. Heylin, “I conceive that he hath faithfully delivered too many sad truths in these particulars.” Among these “sad truths” is the following description of the sort of people who were intruded into the places of the Catholic clergy in England. “Whereas the Church of God so well ordered with excellent men of learning and Godlinesse, is constrained to suffer coblers, weavers, tinkers, tanners, card-makers, tapsters, fidlers, gaolers, and others of like profession, not only to enter into disputing with her, but also to climb up into pulpits, and to keep the place of priests, and ministers, etc.”—p. 2. “Or that any bagpipers, horse-courers, jaylers, ale basters,” (q. ale-tasters?) “were ad-

state of things in England, such the instruments by which the change of religion was effected, it would be wrong to judge of the probability or improbability of their conduct, by the same rules as would guide us, was there question of the Protestant Episcopal clergy of the present day; who, if I am not very much mistaken, would have turned away with disgust from those whom the prejudice of education makes them now regard as deserving of all esteem.

5. We should also be convinced that no opinion, or expression of contempt, that may have been now or formerly entertained or expressed on this subject, can invalidate the *testimony* of contemporary and faith-worthy witnesses; who either testified what they had seen, or bore evidence to what they had heard from those who were eye-witnesses

mitted then into the clergy without good and long trial of their conversation?"—p. 162. Heylin, 174—175. Anthony Fuller bears the following testimony to the degradation of the clerical character at that time:

"As for the inferior clergy under them," (the bishops) "the best that could be gotten were placed in pastoral charges. Alas! tolerability was eminency in that age. A rush candle seemed a torch, where no brighter light was ne'er seen before. Surely preaching now ran very low, if it be what I read that Mr. Tavanour of Water Eaton in Oxfordshire, High Sheriff of the county, came in pure charity, not ostentation, and gave the scholars a sermon at St. Maries, with his gold chain about his neck, and his sword by his side, beginning with the words:

'Arriving at the mount of St. Maries on the stony stage (pulpit), where I now stand, I have brought you some fine biscuits, baked in the oven of charity, and carefully conserved for the chickens of the church, the sparrows of the spirit, and the sweet swallows of salvation.'" Book IX

of the affair; or who attest the public belief of its credibility.

Whether or not such evidence exists in support of the Nag's-head consecration I shall not take upon me to decide. I will impartially detail whatever has been said in support of it, and lay before the reader what has been adduced to confute it, at least as far as I have been able to meet with such objections. I shall then leave it to each one to say whether—if not absolutely certain—it be not highly probable; or whether it be unsupported by any evidence that can shield those who believe it from the imputation of absurd credulity.

## CHAPTER VII.

## Account of the Nag's-head consecration examined.

THE account of this famous, but much disputed, event, is thus given by Doctor Champney, in his book "On the Vocation of Bishops," published in English in 1616, and in Latin, in 1618, which last edition is now before me.— "At the Nag's-head, in Cheapside, by accorded appointment, met all those that were nominated to bishoprics; thither came also the old bishop of Landaff, to make them bishops; which being known to Dr. Bonner, bishop of London, then prisoner, he sent unto the bishop of Landaff, forbidding him, under pain of excommunication, to exercise any such power within his diocese, as to ordain those men. Wherewith the old bishop being terrified, and besides also moved in his own conscience, refused to proceed in that action; alleging, chiefly, for reason of his forbearance, his want of sight: which excuse they interpreting to be an evasion, they were much moved against the poor old man. And whereas, hitherto, they had used him with all courtesy and respect, they then changed their copy; reviling him, and calling him 'doating fool,' and the like: some of them saying, 'This old fool thinketh we cannot be bishops, unless we be greased,'—to the disgrace as well of him, as of the Catholic manner of episcopal consecration. Being notwithstanding thus deceived in their expect-

tation, and having no other means to come to their desire, they resolve to use Master Scory's help, who having borrowed the name of bishop in King Edward's time, was thought to have sufficient power to perform that office, especially in such strait necessity. He having cast off, together with his religious habit, all scruple of conscience, did the thing quickly, which he performed in this sort.— Having the Bible in his hand, they all kneeling before him, he laid it upon every one of their heads or shoulders, saying, '*Take thou authority to preach the word of God sincerely,*' and so they rose up bishops. This whole narration, without adding or detracting any word pertaining to the substance of the matter, I have heard oftener than once, of Master Thomas Bluett, a grave, learned, and judicious priest; he having received it of Master Neal, a man of good sort and reputation, sometime reader of the Hebrew Lecture in Oxford; but when this matter passed, was belonging to Bishop Bonner, and sent by him to deliver the message before mentioned to the bishop of Landaff, and withall to attend there to see the end of the business. Again Mr. Bluett had other good means to be informed of this matter, being a long time prisoner with Dr. Watson, bishop of Lincoln, and other men of note of the ancient clergy, in whose time, and in whose sight, one may say the matter was done. This was related to me by Master Bluett in Wisbech castle." In the Paris edition of 1618, this last circumstance is thus mentioned. "And of this narration, there are now as many witnesses as there are priests living, who were captives for the faith in the aforesaid castle of Wisbech, with the aforesaid Master Bluett, in which place I also had it from him."

. We learn from Pitzaeus, that the same Mr. Neal communicated the fact to one Henry Orton, from whom he, Pitzaeus, heard it.<sup>\*</sup> The learned Jesuit Holliwood, who wrote under the assumed name of ‘Sacrobosco,’—heard it also from Mr. Bluett, and published it in 1603, in the preface to a book called ‘A Discussion.’ Writing against Bishop Jewell, he says: “Of Mr. Jewell’s being a bishop we have not so much certainty: yea, we have no certainty at all: for, who, I pray you, made him? Who gave him his jurisdiction? Who imposed hands on him? What orders had they? What bishops were they? It is true that both he, Sands, Scorey, Horn, Grindall, and others, in the beginning of Queen Elizabeth’s reign, met at the Nag’s head in Cheapside, (a fit sign for such a sacrament) and being disappointed of the Catholic bishop of Landaff, who should have been there to consecrate them, they dealt with Scorey of Hertford, to do so; who, when they were all on their knees, caused John Jewell to rise up bishop of Salisbury, and him that was Robert Horn before, to rise up bishop of Winchester, and so forth with all the rest.” This account Mr. Mason has inserted in his appendix to his Defence of the English Ordinations, and the only reply he attempted to make to it, is, that “no one of common sense could persuade himself that they (the newly elected) had agreed to meet in a tavern, to be consecrated in it, and thus incur the penalty of the law, since they had already an Archbishop, such as they desired, a professor of their religion, and a quiet possessor of his Church and See.” These answers are any thing but conclusive against the narration: for firstly, there has been no law discovered by which consecration in a tavern, or elsewhere

<sup>\*</sup> Lib. De illustre Angliæ, Script. p. 770. Paris, 1618.

out of a Church, is forbidden : and secondly, it cannot be assumed that Parker was already archbishop ; as his consecration is among those said to have taken place on the occasion referred to.

“ It is now a century of years,” says the author of ‘The Nullity of the Prelatic clergy of England,’ “ since the Nag’s head story happened. It has *constantly* been related and credited by wise men, as a certain truth ever since the year 1559, (the year it was acted in): it was never contradicted by any, until it was imagined by our adversaries that the new Registers (Mason’s) might contest with our ancient tradition, and make the Nag’s head story seem improbable in the year 1613, of which no man doubted for the space of fifty-two years before. The Catholic bishops and doctors of Queen Mary’s time were sober and wise men ; they believed the story ; and recounted it to Parsons, Fitzherbert, Dr. Kellison, Holliwood, Dr. Champney, Fitzsimmons, etc. Parsons believed it. Fitzherbert, and the rest above named, gave so much credit to it, that they published it in print.”

We have the following unobjectionable evidence that Harding, Fitzsimmons, and others, believed it and publicly avowed their belief of the fact.” In the year 1616, bishop Godwin published his book, ‘*De Praxis Anglicæ Commentarius*,’ (Commentary of the Bishops of England). In this, of course, he mentions the consecration of Parker on the 17th of Dec., 1559, precisely as Mason had already, in 1613, stated it to have occurred. After which he says:—“ If you enquire about the place of this consecration, this was no other than the usual place, namely, the chapel of the Archiepiscopal palace of Lambeth, *however such scape-graces as Harding, Fitzsim-*

*mons, and others may say otherwise.* Although Harding may possibly be excused, as he delivered (published) what no one had yet denied, although he himself never believed it. For what man of sound mind would put any faith in so absurd and improbable a calumny?\*"†

In the year 1604, Holliwod, (Sacrobosco) published an answer made by Bishop Bancroft to Mr. Wm. Alabaster, who asked him, "how Parker and his colleagues were consecrated bishops?" Bancroft replied: "I hope that in case of necessity, a priest may ordain bishops." "The allusion," says Holliwod, "was evidently intended for Scory, the consecrator at the Nag's-head. This book of Sacrobosco's was published during Bancroft's life; but not a word of denial or disclaimer ever proceeded from him."†

Although the argument drawn from the silence of an historian with regard to contemporary facts, be not, in every case, conclusive; there are circumstances which give it all the weight of positive testimony. John Stowe, the author of "the Chronicles," not only lived in Parker's time, and composed the annals or events of his own times, but was particularly favoured by Parker, who, as we learn from Stowe himself, was fond of the study of antiquities. Now Stowe notes down the consecration and inthronization of Cardinal Pole, Parker's immediate predecessor:

\* De loco si quæras, hujus consecrationis haud alius fuit quam consuetus, capella nimirum palatii archiepiscopalis Tamethensis utcumque diversa tradant impudentissimi rubulæ, Hardingus, Fitzsimons, alii.—Quamquam Hardingo aliquo fortassis modo ignosci possit, quod, quæ nemo adhuc arguerit, tradiderit, sibi tametsi nunquam credita. Quis enim sanæ mentis tam ridicula et ab omni probabilitate abhorrenti calumniæ fidem adhibuerit? Godwin, p. 219. Ed. Lond. 1616.

† Nature of Catholic Faith and Heresy. Rouen, 1657. ch. 2 p. 8.



his reception of the pallium, and the day on which he celebrated his first mass ;—but of Parker's consecration, or of the consecration of any of Queen Elizabeth's first bishops, he says not a word, although he mentions the deprivation of the Catholic bishops in the preceding July.\* Stowe was a Protestant; and, therefore, would not have been silent, through prejudice. Parker's consecration was an event every way worthy of notice. Considerable difficulty is allowed by all to have been experienced about the matter. Two commissions are supposed to have been issued; six lawyers consulted, on the legality of the latter one; and a bishop, named in both, in each instance, refused to act. Parker was the connecting link between the old and the new hierarchy, in point of orders, if his supposed consecration be admitted. What event, then, more necessary to be placed on authentic record? Parker was Stowe's patron; why, then, did this latter omit all mention of an occurrence, which that patron is supposed to have had so much at heart? Parker's consecration was not only important in itself; it was most worthy of remark as to its form: for Mason himself acknowledges that of sixty-nine archbishops who preceded him in the see of Canterbury, none was ever consecrated in the same manner. In a word, if Parker was consecrated at Lambeth, in the circumstances and according to the form alleged, Stowe's silence is, to say the least, most extraordinary: whereas, if he was never consecrated, or consecrated in the manner and place which the foregoing testimonies aver, his silence is easily understood. It would be unreasonable to expect, that he should put on record the shame of his sect, and the everlasting infamy of his friend and protector.

\* Stowe, p. 639

Stowe's silence is, then, almost equivalent to a positive argument against the supposed Lambeth-consecration; but we have something more than his mere silence to allege. We have the positive testimony of men every way worthy of credit, that Stowe had examined into the Nag's-head narrative; that he believed it; that he communicated it to others; and that he was prevented solely by fear from inserting it into his Chronicle. "Not only," says Champney, "the Catholics, who might appear to our adversaries of suspicious faith,—are witnesses of this solemn meeting at the Nag's-head; but also John Stowe, that most famous chronographer of England, a professor of the reformed religion, bore witness to it,—not, indeed, in his writings, for he dared not, but by his word, to some of his acquaintances, men of the most undoubted faith (*integerrimæ fidei*), some of whom are yet living, and attest the same; who however are not to be named here, as they are no less afraid to testify that publicly of him who is now dead, than he was to write it when he lived.

"But concerning this thing I find the following in the manuscripts of that learned and noble man Henry Constable, who, as all who knew him know, was of a strong and sharp mind, and was not easily moved by light conjectures.—'Parker was ordained by at most two heretic priests, not bishops. If indeed Barlow assisted Scorey in that action; which I indeed know not (*quod me quidem latet*). But that old man the bishop of Landaff, who was brought to the place designed for the consecration of Parker and the rest, pretended to have lost the use of his eyes, lest he should commit so great a sacrilege. Whence it happened, that they recurred to Scorey, of whom before they had not thought. Which not only Catholics of most unquestionable integrity, who were eye-witnesses of the

affair, testify, but also John Stowe is witness of the same, who diligently inquired into all the circumstances of this action, although he feared to relate them in his *Chronicle*.”<sup>\*</sup>

Where there is such an abundance of positive and certain authorities, it may appear unnecessary to adduce others which have been contested, and the value of whose evidence may, on that account, be denied, with an appearance of plausibility. I cannot, however, but think it proper to refer to a very remarkable controversy on the subject, said to have taken place in the English Parliament. The author of “*The Nullity of the Prelatic Clergy*,” the same writer who relates the answer of Bishop Bancroft to Alabaster, mentioned in page 89, says, that upon occasion of a certain book, brought into the Parliament house by some Presbyterian lords, *proving that the Protestant bishops had no succession or consecration*, and therefore were *no bishops*, and consequently had *no right* to sit in Parliament, Dr. Morton, bishop of Durham, made a speech against the said book, in behalf of himself and all the bishops then present. In which speech he endeavored to prove their succession from the last Catholic bishops, who, says he, by imposition of hands, ordained the first Protestant bishops at the Nag’s-head, in Cheapside, as was notorious to all the world. This was reported by an ancient Peer, then present in the house.”<sup>†</sup>

Shortly afterwards Dr. Bramhall, bishop of Derry, published his ‘*Consecration and Succession of Protestant bishops justified*,’ in which he contents himself with denying the words attributed to Bancroft, by merely saying, “I do not believe one word of Bishop Bancroft;” and with regard

\* *Champanci de vocatione ministrorum tractatus*, p. 501—502.

† *Nature of Catholic faith and heresy*. Rouen, 1657, ch. 2. p. 9.

to Dr. Morton, he brings a certificate under his own hand, denying that he had ever made the speech attributed to him by the aforesaid author. He also adduces the testimony of some noblemen and bishops, attesting, that they did not remember that such a book against bishops, as is there mentioned, was presented to that Parliament; and therefore Dr. Morton could not have made any speech against it. To this pretended refutation of Dr. Bramhall, the said author of *The Nature of Catholic Faith and Heresy*, in another treatise of his, entitled, *The Nullity of the Prelatic Clergy and Church of England*, printed at Antwerp, in 1669, replied. In this work we find a testimony of Lord Audley, signed with his own hand, in which he directly contradicts the denial of Dr. Morton; because he himself (Lord Audley) was present on the occasion referred to, and heard that prelate speak in the manner already mentioned. Although the testimony of Lord Audley is long, yet as in a matter of such importance, every means of discovering the truth should be employed, I shall here insert it at full.

“Having seen a book entitled *The Consecration and Succession of Protestant Bishops, etc.* and particularly perused that chapter called *The Vindication of the Bishop of Durham*, I find myself (reflecting on some assertion therein, and the Bishop of Derry, author,) obliged to say something as concerned, and so have desired place here for a few lines. Whom the author of the *Treatise of the Catholic Faith, etc.* fixed on to prove his allegations touching the Bishop of Durham’s speech, I know not; for he told me of it, before ever I spoke to him; but sure I am, if it be looked after, he may have sufficient authority to satisfy half a dozen of juries: but that which stirs me to speak in this matter, is a note I have, at the request of the

bishop of Derry, given him under my hand, wherein I say in substance the same with the author, touching the Bishop of Durham's speech. As for the book against Episcopacy, which was the ground of the discourse, my note only avers that it was brought into the house, but says not by whom, nor who was the author. In truth, I wondered much to find that the Bishop of Durham doth deny this speech; for I cannot remember that I ever heard of, or read, the story of the Nag's head, till that day in Parliament of my Lord Durham, and then I heard it from him: and this I say, as I shall answer for it before the judgment-seat of God Almighty. And I do not remember that ever I heard the Bishop of Lincoln, or any other bishop, before or since, mention the Nag's head, or touch upon that story. If I had, and not named him, my Lord of Durham might have just reason to complain: but my Lord of Derry will not believe that I (for I cannot but take it to myself,) do, or ever did, know the Bishop of Derry so well, as to swear this was the man. If his lordship had been an English bishop, and frequented parliaments, he would have omitted this. Not to multiply words, I can assure his lordship, I could as well and as surely have sworn this is the man, the bishop of Durham, as his lordship could of Sir George Radcliff when he lived. Besides, his person and place of the bishop's bench is too eminent to be mistaken. Another expression of my lord of Derry is:—"I do not take myself to be so exact an analyser of a discourse, as to be able to take my oath what was the true scope of it." Here, likewise, I must beg his Lordship's pardon. I know no such defect in myself; for there is not any thing more easy than to comprehend the true scope of a short, plain, historical discourse, as this was. To conclude, as to the bishop of Durham's denial, I hope, that confessing himself now of

the age of ninety-five years, it will be held no crime to say, or improbable to believe, that one of that great age may at least forget what he spake so many years since. For the two *certificates* of the other lords, that of the temporal [lords] says little to my lord of Derry's purpose; neither with an indifferent (impartial) judgment can that of the spiritual (lords, i. e. bishops) work much. For my part, I do not say that any or all their lordships, whose names are put to the *certificate* in the book, were in the house at the time; or, if any of them were, that they took notice of what my lord of Durham spake: for many discourses are made in Parliament, and little notice taken of them; neither had I of this, but that it was to me a new thing. The clerk of the Parliament is also brought in to certify, though as to my note, his pains might have been spared; for I do not mention a book *presented*, and, consequently, none to be recorded: and as for speeches, I do assure his lordship, on the authority of an old parliament-man, that it is not the office of the clerk to record them, (his work would be too great) till it be a result or a conclusion, and then he writes them down as orders, ordinances, etc. of parliament. I will end the short and faithful defence which I have been necessitated to make for myself, with many thanks to my Lord of Derry for his charity and opinion of my ingenuity ('honesty,' from the Latin *ingenuus*,) and seeing his lordship's inclination in this matter is to absolve me from a malicious lie, I will absolve him as to the mistakes either in the person or matter, assuring his lordship and all the world, that there is none."<sup>s</sup> The temperate and Christian tone of this defence is no bad voucher of its truth.

To the testimonies in support of the narrative of the

Nag's-head consecration, many objections, as may naturally be supposed, have been made. Most of these are very trivial; some of them do not at all touch on the real difficulty, and only impeach the consistency of some Catholic writers who have maintained its truth; and only a few present any appearance of real difficulty. I proceed now briefly to notice all the objections that are usually urged by the advocates of Anglican orders against the narrative of this extraordinary event.

*First.* It is not likely that Landall, who had already incurred ecclesiastical censures, by taking the oath of supremacy, would have been afraid of Bonner's threat of excommunication.

*Answer.* This is by no means unlikely: because, on one occasion, he acted without regard to the threat of excommunication in order to keep possession of his see, it does not follow that he would do so again, when so great an interest was not at stake. Besides, although he had incurred the penalty of excommunication, by taking the oath of supremacy, it does not appear that that sentence had been *actually* pronounced upon him. Now Bonner's excommunication was to be *actually* fulminated by Neal.

*Secondly.* It does not appear probable that Kitchin would have been moved by the threat of a man in prison, as Bonner then was.

*Answer.* There is no improbability in the supposition, when that threat was of a spiritual character, the execution of which could not be prevented by Bonner's imprisonment.

*Thirdly.* Bonner could not have a chaplain, while he was confined in the tower.

*Answer.* It is *certain* that he *had*.

*Fourth.* Bonner and Neal would thus have incurred the

penalty of a *premunire* ; now this penalty was never inflicted on them.

*Answer.* A man who, like Bonner, exchanged a palace for a prison, rather than violate his conscience, was not likely to care much for a *premunire*. There were obvious reasons for not enforcing the law.\*

*Fifth.* Mr. Neal, who says he was present, could not say whether it was on the head or shoulders.

*Answer.* Let any one place a large book on the *inclined head* of a person kneeling, and he will be able to say, "head *or* shoulders," precisely as Mr. Neal.

*Sixth.* Ward makes the Nag's-head consecration to have taken place before the 9th of September ; whereas the Queen's commission did not issue before the 6th of December following.

*Answer.* Whether Ward is right or not, makes no matter in this investigation. The genuine commission of the 9th of September, proves that the consecration, if any ever took place, must have been shortly after the 9th of that month. As to the commission of the 6th December, I will prove, in a subsequent chapter, that its authenticity is, at least, very doubtful.

*Seventh.* The silence of the Roman Catholics for upwards of forty-five years after the event is supposed to have taken place, forms a strong presumption against this alleged fact.

*Answer.* Were this silence certain, it would not disprove the truth of the narrative, as will be evident by considering the condition of the Catholics during these forty-

\* For Bonner's boldness of character, see Wood's "Athenæ Oxonienses." Art. "Bonner."



five years. The sanguinary persecution which the Catholics suffered in the reign of Elizabeth, sufficiently shows that, far from having the liberty of publishing, they were obliged to avoid, at the peril of their lives and fortunes, even the external worship of their religion. Hence, those Catholic writers, and they were many, who denied the consecration of the English bishops, were forced to publish their works on the continent of Europe, principally in the Low Countries ; and every conceivable impediment was opposed to their introduction into England during the reign of Elizabeth. The supposed silence of Catholic writers, even were it as real as it is imaginary, is, consequently, no argument against the Nag's-head consecration narrative.

But they were not silent. I have shown, in the third chapter of this book, that, from the year 1563 up to the time of the publication of Mason's book, the Protestant bishops were reproached with having received *no consecration* ; and although this, of itself, may not prove the Nag's-head story, it certainly is conclusive against the supposed consecration at Lambeth ; and is, as will be presently seen, intimately connected with the mock consecration at Cheapside. Mason's work professes, in the title-page, to clear the English bishops and clergy, "from the slanders and odious imputations of Bellarmine, Sanders, Bristow, Harding, Allen, Stapleton, Parsons, Kellison, Endemon, Becanus, and other Romanists." What these "slanders and odious imputations" were, we learn from the work of Mason, who, far from decrying the Nag's-head consecration as a recent fiction, supplies the most positive evidence of the contrary. He shows very clearly that the fact was, before his writing, very generally believed.

“Thus of the Nagges head,” says he, “thought it goe currant at Rome, and be blazed for a truth, through the world by men of your rancke,——.”\*

It is evident from the words of Heylin, already quoted in page 80, that the matter was noised abroad, and published in seditious pamphlets, shortly after the event. And, indeed, how otherwise could an ordinary dinner-party, after the lapse of fifty years, be supposed to have given rise to so improbable a rumour? According to Fuller, “Sanders (who died in 1583) lewdly lies that these new elected bishops, out of good fellowship, mutually consecrated each other.”† The same was also affirmed of Sanders by Dr. Kellison, as we learn from Mason, who, however, says that Sanders mentions no such thing. It may not, perhaps, be found in his “History of the English Schism,” which of all his works is the one most generally known: but these testimonies render it probable that he mentioned it in some other of his numerous works. The denial of Mason is, consequently, inconclusive. We have the positive testimony of Bishop Godwin that Harding mentioned it, and that no one had then as yet denied it.‡ The words of Fuller, shew that long before Kellison and Holliwood (Sacrobosco), the Nag’s head narrative was publicly declared by Parsons and Constable. “But when once one Jesuite had got this shameless lie of the Nag’s head (I cannot say by the tail, but) by the ears, instantly Champney, Fitzsimmons, Parsons, Kellison, and Constable, and all the whole kennel of them, baule it out in their books to all posterity.”§ The only refutation, or rather attempt at

\* Mason, p. 123.

† See p. 88 of this work.

‡ Fuller, lib. 9. p. 60.

§ Fuller, lib. 9, p. 61.

refutation, that I have been able to discover in Mason or Fuller,—and I ought to remark that this latter says that “Mason left no stone unturned to clear the truth,”—is, 1, that some Pope John is said to have ordained a deacon in a stable!—2, that the fable of Pope Joan, although a fable, was yet for a time believed!!—3, that the Nag’s head narrative is so absurd as to be incredible!!!—4, that Parker was consecrated at Lambeth; which is the very thing called in question, and the first *public* announcement of which, in 1613, by Mason, caused universal astonishment in those Catholic writers, who had made the English ordinations the subject of a patient and conscientious examination.

*Eighth.* Kellison, who is said by some Protestant writers to have been the first inventor of the story, before he mentioned it in his controversy with Sutcliff, dwelt principally on the want of a due form, and not on the want of a consecrating prelate.

*Answer.* It is not unusual for Catholic writers to omit the discussion of a matter of fact, when they have objections, which establish their point, even in the *supposition* that the disputed fact actually occurred.

*Ninth.* The silence of the Puritans in their disputes with the early English bishops.

*Answer.* The doctrine of the Anglican church for fifty years after its establishment was, according to Bishop Burnet, that the king’s commission sufficed to make a bishop, and that no external ceremony was absolutely necessary. (See Chapter III.) Hence, the point in dispute between them, regarded rather the character of the Episcopal order, than the necessity of Episcopal consecration; about which there was not, according to Burnet’s

observation, for fifty years after the framing of the articles, any important difference between Anglicans and Presbyterians.

*Tenth.* It is not reasonable to believe that Neal would have been permitted to be present on the occasion.

*Answer.* However unable we may be to account for the apparent oversight committed by the company at the Nag's head, we are not surely on that account to reject a fact, vouched for by respectable testimony. Did not Bonner order Neal to remain during the whole proceeding?—and can any one now undertake to say that Neal could not have done so, without the consent of the new bishops?

*Eleventh.* It is improbable that the new bishops would have chosen to be consecrated in a tavern, when they had all the churches of London at their disposal.

*Answer.* The selection of the Nag's head, as the place of consecration, is very naturally accounted for, by the unwillingness of Kitchin to consecrate, in public, persons whose religious principles he condemned. The validity of the act does not depend on the place in which it is done: and Kitchin would, undoubtedly, have proceeded to the consecration, but for the timely intervention of Bonner.

*Twelfth.* There was no need to have recourse to the Catholic bishops, as there were enough of Protestant bishops to perform the function; namely, Barlow, Hodgkins, Coverdale, Scory, Bale of Ossory, or the Suffragan of Thetford.

*Answer.* These supposed bishops had either never been themselves consecrated, or had been consecrated according to the ritual of Edward, in either of which cases the Queen

would have disregarded their consecration.\* This could easily be shewn of all those here mentioned, and, in another chapter, will be established in regard of Barlow, the only one whose consecration materially affects the question.

*Thirteenth.* The only witness of the Nag's head ceremony is Mr. Neal : and he did not depose to it on oath or before a notary.

*Answer.* Mr. Neal's testimony has never been disproved. As to the want of an oath, or a notary's attestation of it, the remark is too puerile to deserve notice. That Mr. Neal is a competent witness, will be seen from the sketch of his life, given by the learned historiographer of Oxford, Anthony Wood.† Besides the testimony of Mr. Neal, we have the declaration made by Faircloth, one of the priests to whom the Lambeth register was submitted for examination by Archbishop Abbot, in which he

\* Queen Elizabeth seems to have made little or no account of these pretended bishops. Hence, she chose not any one of them to perform the ceremony of her coronation ; but received the crown from the hands of a Catholic bishop, Oglethorpe, the only one of the Episcopal body who would assist at the coronation. " It cannot," says Heylin, " be denied that there were three bishops living of king Edward's making, all of them zealously affected to the reformation. And possibly it may seem strange that the Queen received not the crown rather from one of their hands, than to put herself unto the hazard of so many denials as had been given her by the others." (p. 106.) He then assigns some possible reasons for the Queen's preference but brings nothing to prove, that these motives influenced her choice. The truth is, neither Elizabeth, nor the judges, nor the people, regarded them as bishops.

† See Appendix, Note C.

objected to the register of the consecration at Lambeth : because he had often heard from his father, who was a Calvinist, that the first bishops of the Established Church, had been consecrated at the Nag's head tavern in Cheapside, of which fact he asserted that his father had been witness.

\* Le Quien. T. 1. p, 201. quoted by Collet.

## CHAPTER VIII

## The Lambeth Consecration of Parker.

IN the year 1613, as already mentioned, Mr. Mason, chaplain to Abbot, archbishop of Canterbury, published a work, entitled: "Of the consecration of Bishops in the Church of England, with their Succession, Jurisdiction, and other things incident to their calling, etc., wherein I will clear them from the slanders of Bellarmine, Sanders, Bristow, Harding, Allen, Stapleton, Parsons, Kellison, Eudemon, Becanus, and other Romanists." I have already remarked that the title of this work places beyond all doubt the fact, that the Anglican ordinations were contested, from the very infancy of the established church. In this book, Mathew Parker is said to have been consecrated on the 17th day of December, 1559, at Lambeth, by William Barlow, assisted by Scorey, Coverdale, and Hodgkins. In the margin, reference is made to the Lambeth Register, in these words: *Ex regist. Mat. Park.* This was the first public reference to the Register of Parker, which has since become so famous—the first authentic mention of his having been consecrated at Lambeth by Barlow, or by any one else. Other documents of an earlier date, have since been produced; but they all labour under violent suspicions of having been antedated or interpolated: and it

is certain, that they were not *publicly* made known before the appearance of Mason's work. Before entering on this examination, it may not be unnecessary or unprofitable to make a few general observations on the Lambeth Register, which will prepare the reader for the due investigation of its authenticity.

It is evident from the title to Mason's work, that the validity of the English ordinations was denied by *several* of the greatest names that Catholicism produced in the 16th century. Now, in all their works, there is not the slightest allusion to Parker's supposed consecration at Lambeth. Nay more; the assertion is frequently made, and tauntingly repeated, that the first bishops, namely Parker, Horn, etc., were consecrated—*sine ulla ceremonia,—without any ceremony*;—an assertion that could not have been made, had it been a matter of public notoriety, that Parker was ordained, according to the form prescribed in the Ritual of Edward VI., in the chapel at Lambeth. Had he been so consecrated, the matter must have been notorious: the contrary could never have been supposed, much less repeated, in so many different ways; nor would the Protestant clergy have remained silent during fifty-three years, without any public reference to the Lambeth Register. This argument alone is conclusive evidence that no such Register then existed.

To evade this difficulty, it is replied that before the publication of the Nag's head story in 1603, the whole controversy regarding Anglican ordinations related solely to the question of their validity; that the fact of Parker's consecration at Lambeth, was never before publicly called in question, and, therefore, could not have been denied; but that as soon as the Nag's head story was published,



the calumny was at once indignantly denied, and disproved, by a public reference to the register.

The first part of this answer is opposed to the testimonies adduced in Chapter III., by which it is manifest that the fact of Parker's consecration was denied, and in none of which allusion is made to any such ceremony as is said to have taken place at Lambeth. The concluding assertion, that the Nag's head story was denied as soon as published, is evidently contrary to fact; as the publication was made, at least, in 1603, and it was not until 1613 that the register was referred to. Surely nine or ten years would not have been suffered to elapse, when a reference to a public document would at once have vindicated the character of the English hierarchy.

But if Catholic writers were silent as to the Lambeth consecration, *before* the appearance of Mason's work, they were loud in protesting against it, as a forgery. *immediately* on its appearance. At that very time, in the same year 1613, Fitzherbert, "a man," says Ward, "of great learning and holy life," was engaged in publishing an "*Adjoinder to the Supplement of Father Robert Parsons*;" in the appendix of which,—for the body of the work was printed before the news of Mason's reference to the Lambeth Register reached Rome, where he resided,—he says: "This adjointer being printed, it was my chance to understand, that one Mr. Mason hath lately published a book, wherein he pretends to answer the Preface to Father Parson's Discussion, especially concerning one point treated therein, to wit, The Consecration of the first Protestant Bishops in the reign of Queen Elizabeth; and further, that he endeavours to prove their consecration by a register, testifying that four bishops consecrated Mr

Parker. Understand, good reader, that this our exception, touching the lawful vocation and consecration of the first Protestant bishops, in the late Queen's days, is not a *new quarrel*, lately raised, but vehemently urged, divers times, heretofore by Catholics, many years ago : yea, in the very beginning of the Queen's reign, as namely, by the learned doctors Harding, and Stapleton, against Mr. Jewel, and Mr. Horn, whom they pressed mightily with the defect of due vocation and consecration, urging them to prove the same, and to shew how, and by whom, they were made bishops." (He then gives copious extracts from Harding, and Stapleton, for which see Chapter III.) "And what, trow ye, was answered thereto ? Were there any bishops named who had consecrated them ? Were there any witnesses alleged of their consecration ? Was Mr. Mason's register, or any authentic proof produced, either by Jewel or Horn ? No, truly : for as for Mr. Horn, he never replied ; and Mr. Jewel, though he took upon him to answer it, yet did it so weakly, coldly, and ambiguously, that he sufficiently fortified and justified his adversaries objection."—So convinced was Fitzherbert that such a Register had never before been referred to, that he seemed to doubt whether it actually existed, at the time when Mason quoted it to the astonishment of the Catholic world ; "and therefore," says Champney, who wrote in 1616,—"he said in that aforesaid book to this effect (for his words I have not yet seen), 'that he would return no small thanks to the man, who would assure him that he had seen it.' " 'This was the very opportunity desired by the advocates of the Lambeth Register ; and, accordingly, Abbot, archbishop of Canterbury, to whom Mason had dedicated his work, caused some priests,—Alexander Fayreloth, and Thomas Lathwait, *alias*, Scot, Jesuits, and the archpriest Colliton, and

Thomas Leake, a secular priest, who were then in prison on account of their religion, to be brought to view the Register in the presence of himself, and of six other bishops. \*

The result of this examination is variously stated. The advocates of Anglican ordinations assert, that the priests were satisfied of the authenticity of the Register; whereas the Catholics state that they merely testified that such a document existed; and that Faircloth, one of their number, expressed his astonishment to the Archbishop and Bishops, inasmuch as he had heard from his father, who was a Calvinist, of the Nag's-head consecration, of which his father declared he himself had been a witness. Both Protestant and Catholic writers agree, that the priests were anxious to have the Register submitted to them a second time; when they might have the opportunity of examining it more conveniently. They accordingly addressed a letter to the Archbishop to that effect; but were not able to succeed in getting a second view of the Register. Protestant writers say, that the cause of this refusal, was an apprehension lest they should destroy so important a document; but this appears a very insufficient reason: because the document might be subjected to a private and most searching investigation, in the presence of some faithful officers, without at all exposing it to the alleged danger. The Catholic writers assign a more probable reason for the refusal—the fear lest the spurious character of the Register should be detected and exposed.

If, as is pretended, they were satisfied of the authenticity of these records, why renew their application?—and why require the permission to examine the Register under circumstances more favourable to impartial investigation.

\* Godwin. *De Præsulibus Angliæ.*

than in the presence of an archbishop and six bishops? Does not the importance which was attached to the examination, sufficiently attest that the charge of forgery would not have been made, had the Register been referred to, before the appearance of Mason's book in 1613; or had the objections been so notoriously false, as they must have been, if that document were genuine? Suppose the same objection made against any public act of modern times; and it will be manifest, that it would not last for a day, much less give rise to a solemn examination of a public, and, therefore, well known record, fifty-four years after!

Now I ask the reader to contrast the former silence regarding a Lambeth consecration, with the clamour of the Catholic theologians, and their solemn protest against a document, now for the first time, after upwards of fifty years sharp and continuous controversy on the subject, referred to, by the Chaplain of the Archbishop of Canterbury, whose situation, in itself, is well calculated to diminish the weight of his testimony. It was evidently his *interest* to support the validity of the ordination of Parker; and it was no less evidently in his *power* to foist into the records at Lambeth and elsewhere, the documentary evidence which had been so vainly called for, ever since the time of Bishop Bonner's public and recorded protest that Horn was no bishop.

Whatever explanation may be given of the non-production of the Register, before the year 1613, it is evident that the fact is calculated to awaken suspicion; and, therefore, those Catholic divines who called its authenticity into question, may have been influenced by other motives than those assigned by their adversaries. There is something very strong in the argument of Kellison, who says:—"But as for your registers, I know not whence you have ex-

humed them: they are at least on many accounts suspected by us. For, first, when in the beginning of the new Church in England,—as an English writer (Thomas Fitzharding) rightly observes, in his appendix to the “Supplement,” and the Rev. F. Fitzsimmons, in his most learned “*Britanomachia*” it was objected that these ministers and bishops, although mitred, were neither truly nor lawfully ordained, they would have easily silenced them, and yet they dared not bring forward those acts, or refer to them (allegare). This much increases our suspicion, that they were so late produced, after having remained hid so long; although they had been so often called for by our Doctors.”\*

\* “*Examen novæ Reformationis.*” p. 131.

## CHAPTER IX.

Positive evidence in support of Parker's consecration at Lambeth,  
examined.

THE fact of Parker's consecration at Lambeth was not only denied at the time of its being first publicly announced; but has been since constantly called in question, by Catholic divines, with the exception of, perhaps, four, two of whom, says Dr. Milner, were excommunicated by the Church for their errors; and the third of whom, Courayer, after long wearing the mask of Catholicism, eventually threw it off; and although he appeared occasionally to conform to the Anglican Religion, he was in secret an unitarian. The Rev. J. Lingard, D. D., so celebrated as an historian, and whose name is so deservedly dear to Catholics, on account of his "Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church," and his inimitable controversial tracts, has given to this fact the sanction of his authority. In a note, to his history of Elizabeth, most Catholics were surprised to find him maintaining the fact of Parker's consecration, contrary to the opinion which Catholic writers, with the few exceptions above stated, from the year 1613, had hitherto expressed.

This opinion has afforded a very powerful weapon to the Protestant party, who have not only extended Dr. Lingard's assertion far beyond the limits which he had as-

signed to it; but have taken occasion from it to hold up all the eminent Catholic divines, who had previously maintained the non-authenticity of the Lambeth-record, as persons who had dishonourably and dishonestly sought to defend their cause, by impeaching the certainty of the best authenticated facts.

This famous note is inserted here entire.

Note (H.) English edition, 4to. Vol. 5—(J.) American edition. Vol. 7, of History of England, by John Lingard, D. D.

“It may, perhaps, be expected that I should notice a story, which was once the subject of acrimonious controversy between the divines of the two communions. It was said that Kitchin and Scorey, with Parker and the other bishops elect, met in a tavern, called the Nag’s head, in Cheapside; that Kitchin, on account of a prohibition from Bonner, refused to consecrate them, and that Scorey, therefore, ordering them to kneel down, placed the bible on the head of each, and told him to rise up bishop. The facts that are really known are the following. The Queen, from the beginning of her reign, had designed Parker for the Archbishopric. After a long resistance, he gave his consent; and a *cong   d’elire* was issued to the dean and chapter, July 18th, 1559. He was chosen August 1. On Sept. 9th, the Queen sent her mandate to Tunstal, bishop of Durham, Bourne, of Bath and Wells, Pool, of Peterborough, Kitchin, of Landaff, Barlow, the deprived bishop of Bath, under Mary, and Scorey, of Chichester, also deprived under Mary, to confirm and consecrate the Archbishop elect. (Rym. xv. 541.) Kitchin had conformed; and it was hoped that the other three, who had not been present in Parliament, might be induced to imitate his

example. All three, however, refused to officiate ; and in consequence, the oath of supremacy was tendered to them ; (Rym. xv. 545,) and their refusal to take it was followed by deprivation. In these circumstances no consecration took place ; but three months later, (Dec. 6,) the Queen sent a second mandate, directed to Kitchin, Barlow, Scorey, Coverdale, the deprived bishop of Exeter, under Mary, John, Suffragan of Bedford, John, Suffragan of Thetford, and Bale, bishop of Ossory, ordering them, or any four of them, to confirm or consecrate the archbishop elect : but with an additional clause, by which she, of her supreme royal authority, supplied whatever deficiency there might be according to the statutes of the realm, or the laws of the church, either in the acts done by them, or in the person, state, or faculty of any of them, such being the necessity of the case, and the urgency of the time. (Rym. xv. 549.) Kitchin again appears to have declined the office. But Barlow, Scorey, Coverdale, and Hodgkins, Suffragan of Bedford, confirmed the election on the 9th ; and consecrated Parker on the 17th. The ceremony was performed, though with a little variation, according to the ordinal of Edward VI. Two of the consecrators, Barlow and Hodgkins, had been ordained bishops, according to the Roman Pontifical : the other two according to the Reformed ordinal. (Wilk. Conc. iv. 198.) Of this consecration on the 17th of December, there can be no doubt ; perhaps in the interval between the refusal of the Catholic prelates, and the performance of the ceremony, some meeting may have taken place at the Nag's head, which gave rise to the story."

A correspondent of the " Birmingham Catholic Magazine," having called on Dr. Lingard, through the pages of



that periodical, for his proofs, the learned writer addressed the following letter to the Editor, some time in 1834.

MR. EDITOR,—In your last number a correspondent, under the signature of T. H., has called on me to show why I have asserted, (Hist. v. 155, note H.) that the Archbishop Parker was consecrated on the 17th of December, 1559. Though I despair of satisfying the incredulity of one who can doubt after he has examined the documents to which I have referred, yet I owe it to myself to prove to your readers the truth of my statement, and the utter futility of any objection which can be brought against it.

I. The matter in dispute is, whether Parker received, or did not receive consecration on the 17th of December; but the following facts are, and must be admitted on both sides: 1st. That the Queen having given the royal assent to the election of Parker, by the Dean and chapter of Canterbury, sent on September 9, a mandate to six prelates to confirm and consecrate the archbishop-elect, and that they demurred, excusing, as would appear from what followed, their disobedience by formal exceptions on points of law. 2d. That on the 6th December, she issued a second commission to seven bishops, ordering them, or any four of them, to perform that office, with the addition of a sanatory clause, in which she supplied, by her supreme authority, all legal or ecclesiastical defects on account of the urgency of the time, and the necessity of the things; “*temporis ratione et rerum necessitate id postulante;*” words which prove how much the Queen had this consecration at heart; and certainly not without reason, for at that time, with the exception of Landaff, there was not a diocese provided with a bishop, nor, as the law then stood, could any such provisio be made

without a consecrated archbishop, to confirm and consecrate the bishops-elect. 3d. That four out of seven bishops, named in the commission, (they had been deprived or disgraced under Queen Mary, but had now come forward to offer their services, and solicit preferment in the new Church,) having obtained a favourable opinion from six counsel learned in the law, undertook to execute the commission, and confirmed Parker's election on the 9th of December.

II. Now, these facts being indisputable, what, I ask, should prevent the consecration from taking place? The Queen required it; Parker, as appears from his subsequent conduct, had no objection to the ceremony, and the commissioners were ready to perform it, or rather under an obligation to do so; for by the 25th of Henry VIII. revived in the last parliament, they were compelled, under the penalty of *præmunire*, to proceed to the consecration within twenty days after the date of the commission. Most certainly all these preliminary facts lead to the presumption that the consecration did actually take place about the time assigned to it, the 17th of December, a day falling within the limits I have just mentioned.

III. In the next place, I must solicit the attention of your readers to certain indisputable facts, subsequent to that period. These are—1st. That on the 18th [and the date is remarkable] the Queen sent to Parker no fewer than six writs addressed to him, under the new style of Matthew, Archbishop of Canterbury, and primate and metropolitan of all England, and directing him to proceed to the confirmation and consecration of six bishops elect for six different sees. This was the first time, during the six months, which had elapsed since his election, that any such writ had been directed to him. What, then, could

have happened, just before the 18th, to entitle him to this new style, and to enable him to confirm and consecrate bishops, which he could not do before? The obvious answer is, that he himself had been consecrated on the 17th. 2nd. That on the 21st, he consecrated four new bishops, on the 21st of January, five others, two more on the 2d, and two on the 24th of March. Can we suppose, that so much importance would be attached to consecration given by him if he had received no consecration himself? or, that the new Church would have been left so long without bishops at all, if it had not been thought necessary that he, who was by law to consecrate the others, should previously receive that rite? 3d. That afterward, at the same time with the new prelates, he obtained the restoration of his temporalities, a restoration which was never made till after consecration. 4th. That he not only presided at the convocation but sat in successive parliaments, which privilege was never allowed to any but consecrated bishops. In my judgment, the comparison of these facts, with those that preceded the 17th of December, forms so strong a case, that I should not hesitate to pronounce in favor of the consecration, if even all direct and positive evidence respecting it had perished.

IV. But there exists such evidence in abundance. That Parker was consecrated on the 17th of December is asserted, 1st by Camden, [i. 49,] 2d, by Godwin, [De Praes. p. 219,] 3d, by the Archbishop himself in his work, *De Antiquitate Britannicæ Ecclesiæ*, published in 1572, three years before his death, or if that book be denied to be his, in his diary, in which occurs the following entry in his own hand, "17th Dec. Ann. 1559 consecratus sum in Archiepiscopum Cantuariensem. Heu ! Heu ! Domine

Deus, in quæ tempora servasti me! [Strype's Parker, App. 15.] And 4th, by the Archbishopal Register, a record which details the whole proceeding, with the names of the bishops, of their chaplains, and of the official witnesses. In truth, it descends to so many minute particulars that I think, Mr. Editor, it must be the model after which are composed the descriptions of consecrations, ordinations, and dedications, which we have the pleasure of perusing in your pages. In one respect only must it yield the superiority to them. It names not either the organist or the singers.

V. Now to this mass of evidence, direct and indirect, what does your correspondent oppose? That Harding and Stapleton, and the more ancient Catholic controversialists, denied that Parker was a bishop. That is, indeed, true: but I always understood that their objections [which is certainly the case, with respect to the two passages quoted in your last number] referred to validity, not to the fact of his consecration; and if Dr. Milner has chanced to assert the contrary, I fear that he wrote it hastily, and without consideration. I am not aware of any open denial of the facts till about fifty years afterward, when the tale of the foolery supposed to have been played on the Nag's Head was published. In refutation of that story, Protestant writers appealed to the Register; their opponents disputed its authority; and the consequence was, that in 1614, Archbishop Abbot invited Colleton, the arch-priest with two or three other Catholic missionaries, to Lambeth, and submitted the register to their inspection in the presence of six of his own episcopal colleagues. The details may be seen in Dodd, ii. 277, or in Godwin, p. 219.

VI. Your correspondent assures us that the register contains "so many inaccuracies and points at variance with

the history of the times, as manifestly prove it a forgery." Were it so, there still remains sufficient evidence of the fact. But what induces T. H. to make this assertion? Has he examined into all the circumstances of the case? Or does he only take for granted the validity of the several objections which are founded on misconception or ignorance; that the register agrees in every particular with what we know of the history of the times; and there exists not the semblance of a reason for pronouncing it a forgery.

VII. Your readers will observe that in this communication I have confined myself to the fact of Parker's consecration; whether it was valid or invalid, according to Catholic doctrine, is a theological question, with which, as a mere writer of history, I had no concern.

JOHN LINGARD.

On first reading the note of Dr. Lingard and the foregoing letter, in support of it, I was easily persuaded that the opinion there expressed was the result of researches, which, probably, his predecessors in the English mission, had not been able to make; and I acquiesced without difficulty in the probable certainty of a fact which was so strongly asserted by a distinguished Catholic historian. Still, the authority of Dr. Milner, who evidently disbelieved the Lambeth-record, always left doubt on my mind; and I had no hesitation in believing that, if that uncompromising defender of Catholic truth were yet alive, he would have endeavoured to vindicate himself from the charge of having "written hastily"—for on such a subject it is a serious charge,—with which, as the reader has seen, Dr. Lingard answers the argument derived from his authority. Circumstances subsequently directed my attention to the subject; and I own that I felt no little surprise on discovering

that the arguments brought forward by Dr. Lingard, were derived from authorities, the authenticity of which had been long and publicly questioned, and, in my opinion, fully disproved. Instead of finding any new argument adduced by one of the latest, and,—notwithstanding some blemishes, I must add,—best historians of England, I found that he was merely urging the objections which Courayer had, more than a century ago, put forward, and which had been triumphantly refuted at the time by the learned Hardouin, and in the celebrated work of Father Le Quien.

In thus combating the opinion of Dr. Lingard, I have no other object in view than to arrive at the truth in this matter. The fact of Parker's consecration at Lambeth might be admitted, and yet the validity of the Anglican Ordinations denied; as the consecration of Barlow, Parker's supposed consecrator, is also called in question, and cannot be proved, except by inference. The fact of Parker's consecration at Lambeth is, consequently, only *one* of many facts, that must be established, before the validity of the English orders is admitted.

In the following attempt to meet the *arguments* brought forward by Dr. Lingard, I have numbered the paragraphs of his letter for the facility of reference.

I. The matter of this paragraph is contained in three sections, the first only of which I consider true. As to the cause of the demur, I beg leave to conjecture it must have been different from that suggested by Dr. Lingard. Does he seriously believe that the law officers of the crown were on the watch to detect any legal informality in the proceeding?—or that Elizabeth could not have “supplied”

\* This and the following numbers refer to the divisions of Dr. Lingard's letter (p. 114); and the corresponding paragraph of that letter, should be read and considered before each portion of the answer.

these defects, if any such existed, as easily in September, as in December?

The commission of September is undeniable; because, as found in Rymer, it is attested—“*Per breve de privato sigillo,*” and as such would be admitted as evidence in any court of justice. The commission of the 6th December is without any mark of authenticity in Rymer; and, therefore, must have had no seal or other mark of Royal origin. It must, consequently, be rejected as not authentic, —at least, as doubtful; especially as it is in opposition to a commission, “*Per ipsam Reginam,*” dated 20th of October, 1559, the authenticity of which cannot be denied. In this commission, as already mentioned, Parker is styled Matthew, Archbishop of Canterbury, Grindal is styled Edmund, bishop of London, and Cox is called Richard, bishop of Ely. I have already established, from the style and object of this commission, that Parker, Grindal, and Cox were bishops, at least were regarded as such, and in possession of their respective sees, on the 20th of October, almost two months before the pretended consecration at Lambeth, on the 17th of the following December.’ The third fact is by no means admitted,—it being intimately and necessarily connected with the one at issue, and supported by no evidence that is not now matter of controversy.

II. These facts—i. e. the two last,—are not only disputable, but I flatter myself that I have already proved them to be irreconcilable with a public and official document. The whole of this paragraph is grounded on what I cannot but consider the false supposition, that Elizabeth issued a commission in December, for Parker’s consecration, which is the very point in dispute, and which seems disproved by the authentic act referred to in the preceding paragraph.

III. This argument is certainly weak. Because six writs are said to have been issued to Parker as Archbishop on the 18th of December, it is concluded that, *therefore*, he was consecrated on the 17th. Does it not equally follow from the commission above referred to of the 20th of October, that he was consecrated on the 19th of this latter month, just two months before the date of the six writs? Not a single one of these six writs, as may be seen in Rymer, has the stamp of authenticity before referred to. Besides, can we attach any credit to writs for the consecration of Grindal, and Cox, who, according to the commission of the 20th of October, were bishops, the one of London and the other of Ely,—at least on the 19th of that month? To the second section of this paragraph, it is enough to reply, that Parker consecrated other bishops, has never been denied; but that his own consecration is hence to be inferred, is a point which has been long contested, and yet is to be proved. Did not Coke, who was made bishop by Wesley, a simple minister of the Church of England, ordain and consecrate bishops? Does not the quotation given from Burnet in p. 32, sufficiently show that the English Reformers thought themselves justified by the necessity of the case in doing what otherwise would be irregular? Was not the Queen's authority more than enough to supply all defects, and silence all objections? and were not the spoils of the church sufficient to make men, who looked on the imposition of hands as a rite of merely human origin,—a useless, if not a superstitious ceremony,—pass over the radical defect of their consecrator's power? The third section of this paragraph merely shows that the Queen consented to acknowledge him as bishop; it by no means establishes the fact that he



was really such; no more than the never-to-be-forgotten commission of the 20th of October.

IV. This is the strongest part of the evidence in support of the Lambeth consecration; but yet not entirely conclusive in its favour, as I submit for the following reasons. 1. Camden first published his "Annals,"—the work here referred to,—in 1615,—two years *after* the appearance of Mason's work. Now what more natural, than that he should adopt the narrative which Mason had published, especially as this was the one most likely to find favour with the court, for which he wrote, his book being dedicated to James I? At all events, the date of his testimony is enough to prevent its admission on the present occasion.—2. Godwin's work, *Commentarius de Præsulibus Angliæ*, appeared first in English in 1601; and afterwards in Latin, in 1615. This edition contains the narrative of Parker's consecration at Lambeth, which is not found in the preceding one published in 1601. It is evident, then, that Godwin followed the authority of Mason; and so far from his testimony being favourable to the Lambeth record, his silence on the subject in 1601, is almost conclusive, that, at that time, he was not aware of its existence. At the time that Camden and Godwin wrote, the fact of Parker's consecration was contested; and all means of supplying corroborative evidence of the presumed fact would naturally be sought for, and, in the circumstances, easily obtained. 3. As to the testimony derived from the supposed work of Parker, it is certain that that work was not made *public*, until after the appearance of Mason's book; whether it was printed subsequently or not, is a matter of comparatively minor importance; because, in either supposition, it seems purposely designed

## ANGLICAN ORDIN/

to have been *prepared* as a testimony in favour of its supposed author's consecration. That this is not a groundless surmise, will appear by the following statement.

At the commencement of the reign of James I., of Great Britain, after the death of Elizabeth, the tradition of the ordination made at the Nag's-head Tavern, in September, was repeated louder than ever by the Catholics and Presbyterians, in their endeavours to profit by the change of government. The Presbyterians said, that the pretended bishops were mere priests like themselves; having only been ordained by the imposition of Parker's hands, who, himself, had received it from a simple priest, Scorey, at the tavern; and consequently that if they had seats in Parliament, the Presbyterians should not be excluded from them. For the same reason the Catholics maintained, that the episcopacy and priesthood had ceased in England.

This great clamour obliged the Anglican clergy to do every thing possible to discredit this narrative; and among the means employed, was the production of false documents of all kinds; especially of false Registers, and of a work attributed to Parker, concerning the Antiquities of the British Church.\* These record, or refer to, the conse-

\* If any one is inclined to blame me for attributing the crime of forgery to some defenders of the Anglican orders, especially to Mason, let him remember, *non meus hic sermo*—that I have very respectable and most unsuspected authority to warrant me in the use and application of the word. "FORGERY—I blush for the honour of Protestantism, while I write it—seems to have been peculiar to the Reformed.—I look in vain for one of these accursed outrages of imposition amongst the disciples of Popery."—These are the words of Whitaker, a Protestant Divine, the vindicator of the calumniated and murdered Queen of Scots. See *Vindication of Mary, etc.*, vol. 3, p. 2. See also pp. 45, 46, etc. Again: "Forgery appears to have been the peculiar disease of Protestantism." p. 54.

cration said to have taken place at Lambeth, on the 17th of December, 1559 ; and hence it was argued that the succession of bishops in England, had not been interrupted. No historian, no printed work in general circulation, mentioned this consecration. It was then necessary to have some work of an early date to produce ; and it was also necessary that but a few copies of such a work should be extant, in order to account for the fact of finding in it what was not before generally known to the public, namely, the consecration of Parker, at Lambeth, and some other similar facts connected therewith. The best way for accounting for the obscurity in which this book had hitherto lain, was to make Parker himself the author of it, who, through modesty, it might be said, had only caused a few copies to be printed. A work written by himself, which might appear to have been printed in his time, and which bore testimony to the fact, would be of great weight in this affair. Who could be better instructed than the supposed archbishop himself? And who would venture to object to a witness whose testimony, although now brought forward for the first time, had been recorded thirty years before? He was, then, to be made the writer of his own life, and in this he would refer to his consecration at Lambeth. It was determined to write the lives of all the Archbishops of Canterbury,—to add his to the rest,—and to terminate just about two years before his death. It was printed in London, with the date 1572 ; that thus it might appear to have been published under his own inspection.

To give colour to this scheme, but very few copies were struck off, which, it might be supposed, Parker got published for his private friends. Another edition was published at Hanau, in Germany, with the date of 1605, and purported to be taken from the London edition of

1572 : and to authorize the belief that the smallness of the first edition was owing to the modest reserve of Parker ; the edition printed in Germany does not contain the life of Parker, although its title-page professes to give the lives of the seventy Archbishops of Canterbury,—Parker being the seventieth. This title was left in it to supply an additional proof that the life of Parker, found in the supposed edition of 1572, was by the same hand as the rest of the work, although, through excessive modesty, suppressed in some of the few copies that had issued from the London press. After much search in England, during the most stormy period of the ordination-controversy, only twenty-one copies of the edition of 1572 could be discovered, and but thirteen of these contained the life of Parker. There are, however, two tables in pp. 37 and 39 of the copies that have not his life, in which the day of his own consecration, and the other episcopal acts ascribed to him in the Register, are mentioned. Whether the work was antedated, or whether it was really published about the time it purposed to have been, matters little. It is obvious that in either case, it cannot be brought forward as evidence ; and this Dr. Lingard seems fully to admit. Does not all this supply a strong suspicion of fraud ? Whatever may be thought of the real date here assigned to Parker's supposed book, it is evident that it was not known to Sacrobosco (Hollivood), who in 1603 published an account of the Nag's head consecration ; and that it was not printed, or, at least, published, until about the time of Mason's reference to the famous Lambeth Register. Had it been published in London, in 1572, or in Germany, in 1605,—would not the Catholic writers have mentioned something of the consecration at Lambeth ? Would the Nag's head consecration have been published so late as

1603? Would the appearance of Mason's work have caused so much wonder, and called forth such numerous replies, if the Register had been publicly referred to, forty years before, in London, and eight years before in Germany?<sup>k</sup> The only testimony for the insertion in Parker's diary, *in his own hand*, is a copy to which Courayer referred in 1725, and which was said to contain a note to that effect by the son of Parker, written before 1603. Is it seriously pretended that such evidence is to be admitted on a question of such vital importance?

In reply to the fourth section of this paragraph, I deny the authenticity of the Lambeth Register, and that for the following reasons, in addition to those before mentioned.

1. The wording of the record in the Register is suspicious, in as much as it is different from that of all the entries that precede and follow it. Thus :

Anno 1559, Mathaei Parkeri Cant. Consec. 17 Dec. per (In the year 1559, The Consecration of Matthew Parker, of Canterbury, on the 17 Dec. by	{ Gulielmum Barloum, Joannem Scoreum, Milonem Coverdallum, Joannen Hodgkinsonum.  { William Barlow, John Scorey, Miles Coverdale, John Hodgkinson.)
---	---

Now the reader is particularly desired to observe, that the four bishops mentioned as assisting at the consecration

\* See the authenticity of this work fully disproved in *La Defense des Ordinations Anglaises, refutée*, par le Pere Hardouin. Tom. 1, p. 204, Paris, 1727.

of Parker, are designated merely by their *names*, without the title of any See being given to them. This is contrary to the established use in such cases, as appears by the following record of a consecration, said to have taken place four days afterwards :

Anno 1559,	{	Math, Archiepisco. Cant.
Edm. Grindallus,		Gulielmum, Cicestrenser,
Consecr. 21 Decemb.,		Johannem, Herefordism,
per		Johann. Bedford.
(In the year 1559, on the	{	Mathew, Archbishop of
21 Dec.		Canterbury,
Edward Grindal		William, of Chichester,
was Consecrated		John, of Hereford,
by	{	John, of Bedford.)

How can we account for this remarkable difference of language, the former of which is an entire departure from the accustomed style ; especially when we know from an authentic royal commission, that Parker was named by the style and title of Mathew, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Grindal, whose consecration is here stated to have taken place, as Edmond of London,—just two months before the date of this record ? The only plausible answer that can be made to this difficulty, is that the consecrator of Parker and his assistants were not in actual possession of any see, at the time of Parker's consecration ; whereas both he and the others named in the Register of Grindal's consecration, were actually in possession at the time it took place. I will let this plea be judged of by the reader, as I do not rely so much on the informality of the record, as on the other circumstances connected with its history. It must, however, be admitted that it looks very extraordinary and suspicious, as it is the only one in the

Register that is liable to the same difficulty ; especially as those named in it, have the style and title of their dioceses annexed to their names in the act of Parker's confirmation, which was, of course, previous to his consecration.

2. There is a great variety among those who quote the Register, as to the number of bishops present on the occasion, and the name of one of them. " 'This disagreement,'" says Courayer himself, " is very obvious : for one says that Parker was consecrated by Barlow, Scorey, Coverdale, and John, Suffragan of Dover ; Sutcliff joins to the three first two suffragans. 'The author of the lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury, has but one suffragan with the three bishops, who is Richard, suffragan of Bedford. Mason agrees with the latter as to the number, only he calls the suffragan John. In short, the record of the 6th of December, found in Rymer, names seven to whom the mandate for consecration is addressed—so that we see five different accounts of the same facts.' " \* To this objection Courayer replies that although those who quote, or refer to the Register, vary, the Register is the same, in all the works in which it has appeared. But we must remark, that the writers, whom he quotes, profess to have examined the Register themselves, which seems irreconcilable with the fact.

3. The circumstantiality of the Register is remarkable, and, of itself, is enough to excite suspicion. There does not seem to have been any necessity for putting on record that the ' chapel towards the east was hung with tapestry,' that ' there was a red cloth on the floor,'—although purple is the colour used in Advent,—and it being then the 17th of December, that there was a sermon, concourse of people, —especially as it was *about* five or six o'clock in the

\* Courayer, p. 40.

morning,—*Mune circiter quintam aut sextam horam*,\*—that the ceremony commenced—that is, about two or three hours before day-light!—not to mention any thing of Miles Coverdale's 'woollen gown,' etc. All this appears so much out of place, and contains so many improbabilities, that it would alone suffice to give rise to suspicions of some sinister design in the extraordinary minuteness of its details. *Nimia cautio dolum prodit.*

3. According to Mr. Mason, whose statement must be bound up with the Register, Parker was elected by the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury about December;† whereas according to Stowe and Hollinshed, and indeed all who now maintain the fact of his consecration, he was bishop elect on the 9th of the preceding September: and according to the Royal Commission of 20th of October, was "the Most Reverend Father in Christ, Mathew, Archbishop of Canterbury,"—two months before he is said to have been elected!

4. In the Chronicle of Hollinshed it is stated that Tunstal, bishop of Durham, "was by the noble Queen Elizabeth, deprived of his bishopric, etc., and was committed to Mathew Parker, bishop of Canterbury, who used

\* See Register of *Corpus Christi* College, Cambridge, given in the Appendix to Courayer. This Register appears to have been first made public in 1676.

† This is in the original edition of 1613. In a Latin edition of his work, published shortly after, this oversight was sought to be corrected; at least Williams, who answered Ward, says that in this latter edition, Mason assigns his election to the 1st of August. In the first edition it was thus recorded: "December, the dean and chapter having received the *congé d' elire*, elected Master Doctor Parker for their Archbishop,"—which words, according to Williams, "are general, without any reference in the margin to any particular time"!



him very honourably, both for the gravity, learning, and age of the said Tunstal : but he not long remaining under the ward of the said bishop, did shortly after, the 18th of November, in the year 1559, depart this life at Lambeth, where he first received his consecration." Hence, Parker was in possession of Lambeth palace, and was 'bishop of Canterbury' in the month of November ; whereas, if we believe Dr. Lingard, he only obtained the restoration of his temporalities in the year 1560—"a restoration which was never made till after consecration." Hence, whatever consecration Parker received, must have been before the 18th of November, 1559.

5. It does not appear that the Archbishops of Canterbury were ever consecrated at Lambeth ; at least Courayer, the most laborious and able defender of English ordination, was not able to refer Hardouin to any instance before that of Archbishop Sancroft—one hundred years after the supposed consecration of Parker. The reason of this is easily seen. During the vacancy of the see, Lambeth is under the Chapter of Canterbury, whose jurisdiction subsists until the new bishop is enthroned, a ceremony that necessarily follows his consecration. Hence, the Archbishop elect would be obliged to *ask* permission from the Chapter, to have his consecration performed in a chapel or church belonging to their jurisdiction. This he would naturally enough avoid doing, by being consecrated elsewhere. At least, such appears to have been the case prior to the consecration of Archbishop Sancroft.

6. According to Mason, who quotes the Register as his authority, Parker was elected by virtue of a writ of *congé d'elire*, directed to the Chapter of Canterbury.<sup>1</sup> Now the

\* Juxta morem antiquum, et laudabilem consuetudinem ecclesiæ prædictæ ab antiquo usitatam et observatam. Mason lib. 3, p. 126.

writ of *congé d'elire* was abolished by act of Parliament of 25 Henry VIII. It was restored in Queen Mary's time ; but was again abolished by the revival of the aforesaid act of Henry VIII. in the first year of Elizabeth. By this act the liberty of election was taken from the chapters, to whom the King or Queen directed letters missive, directing them to elect the person therein named.

Many other reasons might be advanced to prove that the Lambeth Registry is a document without any intrinsic evidence of authenticity, and contradicted by public and notorious facts, related in the contemporary histories of the time, and most especially by the Royal Act of the 20th of October, which alone suffices to disprove, or, at least, involve in doubt and obscurity, whatever may be adduced in support of Parker's consecration subsequent to that date.

It is said that the Lambeth register is referred to in the following passage of the act of 8th of Elizabeth.

“That every thing requisite and material hath been made and done as precisely, and with as great care and diligence, or rather more, as ever the like was done before her majesty's time, as the records of her majesty's said father and brother's time, and also of her *own time*, will more plainly testify and declare.”

But it is evident that the records here referred to are those of parliament itself, and not of Lambeth.

A still more plausible argument in support of the Lambeth-register, is taken from the preamble to the act of Parliament just referred to, wherein it is stated that the Queen had not only made use of the same terms as had been formerly used by Henry VIII. and Edward VI., in her letters patent ; but had also *supplied* by her royal authority whatever defects and imperfections might be in the parties

concerned; as appears by her letters duly recorded.— This reference is deemed an unanswerable argument in favor of the authenticity of the royal commission of the 6th of December 1559; as this is the only commission of the kind which has the *supplying* clause, given in pa. 43, of this work. Hence it is inferred that that commission is genuine; and that the Lambeth-register, as a matter of course, cannot be rejected without contradicting an act of Parliament of unquestionable and acknowledged authenticity.

Imposing as this argument appears, it is not conclusive. The royal act referred to in the foregoing part of the preamble to the act of 8th Elizabeth, is expressly stated to be letters patent under the Great Seal of England; whereas such commissions as that of the 6th December 1559, are never under the Great Seal of England, but have generally the King or Queen's privy seal attached to them. The commission of 6th Dec. as before observed, has, however, no seal whatever; at least, Rymer, who is most minute in describing such marks of authenticity, is silent on the subject. From this it appears that the letters patent referred to in the act of 8th Elizabeth are not the commission of 6th Dec. 1559; and consequently, that the argument drawn from the supposed reference is destitute of foundation.

Hardouin contends, and not without some appearance of reason, that the *supplying* clause of the commission of 6th Dec. 1559, was suggested to the mind of whoever forged this document, by the above reference. The object of the supplying clause in the Letters Patent must have been to remove whatever canonical or legal defect might be in the person elected to be bishop, or in those who were to consecrate him; such as might arise from illegitimacy of birth, or any of the irregularities established

by the laws of the church. Such precautionary dispensations are by no means uncommon, or rather are matters of course ; whereas the fact, that the *supplying* clause, given in pa. 42, is no where found but in the commission of 6th Dec. 1559, and is very much calculated to strengthen the suspicion, that it was inserted therein, through the mistake of whoever undertook to compose the aforesaid act.

It is also said that reference was made to these records, thirty years before the publication of Mason's book, in the controversy between Rainolds and Hart ; but as this rests on the sole *ipse dixit* of Mr. Mason, whose unsupported testimony, especially as he is on his trial for forgery, cannot be admitted as evidence of any fact tending to exculpate him from the charge. That no such public reference was made, is evident from the line of argumentation adopted in Chapter VIII.

V. The extracts from Harding, Stapleton, and the most ancient Catholic controversialists, adduced in Chapter III., of this work, especially the words of Bishop Godwin, who wrote in 1615, prove, not only that they denied the *validity* of Parker's consecration, but that they denied the *fact* of his having ever received episcopal consecration. That Dr. Milner did not through mere chance, or without consideration, assert the contrary of what Dr. Lingard now states, appears by his "End of Controversy," his "Vindication of it," and his letter to Dr. Elrington, which last will be found in the Appendix to this work.\* It is not true, that, on the first publication of the Nag's-head consecration, by Sacrobosco, in 1603, Protestants appealed to the Register. It was only in 1613 that the world was informed of the existence of such a document ; and so great

\* Note D.

was the amazement of the Catholic writers, that Fitzsimmons, in the same year, stated that the fact was of an entirely novel character. Could its existence have been called in question by so many writers at that time;—would six bishops and the Archbishop have assembled to exhibit it, if it had been before referred to—if its existence was a matter of public notoriety? The result and *full* account of this conference has been already seen at the close of the last chapter, and it is more calculated to excite suspicion than to allay doubt.

VI. The reader will pass his own judgment on the assertions contained in this paragraph. After what has been said, they must, to say the very least, appear most extraordinary.

VII. Dr. Lingard deserves the thanks of the Catholics for this declaration. His strong, and, as I think, erroneous assertion of the fact of Parker's consecration, has been most unjustifiably construed into an admission of the *validity* of the Anglican orders,—an opinion, which, as will be shown in a future chapter, is entirely independent of Parker's consecration; and cannot be held by a Catholic without temerity.

And now, having terminated this minute examination of the arguments in support of the Lambeth-Register, I beg to conclude in the words of Ward:

“Now that the Lambeth story's dono,  
Judge what you please.”

## CHAPTER X.

## Barlow's consecration examined.

THE consecration of Mathew Parker at Lambeth, even if established,—which from the preceding, to most readers will appear, at least, very doubtful,—is not sufficient to prove that he was validly consecrated; because, not to speak of the form, about which see Chapter XI., there are strong reasons to doubt whether William Barlow, his supposed consecrator, had himself been consecrated. It is *certain* that Barlow was appointed bishop of St. Asaph's in the reign of Henry VIII., and that he afterwards resigned that bishopric; it is generally *believed* that he was subsequently made bishop of St. David's, although this, as will be seen in the sequel, is by no means absolutely established; and it is unquestionable that he was named by Elizabeth to the see of Chichester, in which Parker, according to the Lambeth Register, confirmed him a few days after he is supposed to have confirmed and consecrated Parker!

It is admitted on all hands, that the certificate, or register of his consecration has never been found, although all possible diligence has been employed to discover it. The only proofs of his consecration are, therefore, inferential, derived from the supposed fact that he was for years considered to be a bishop, by his contemporaries; that he sat

in Parliament as such, etc. These, it is contended, are sufficient to establish his consecration ; which cannot be called in question on account of the want of a register of the fact, no more than that of several other bishops of whose consecration there has never been any doubt entertained.

There is, however, a remarkable difference between the fact of Barlow's consecration, and that of those other bishops, the record of whose consecration does not appear.\* Barlow is the connecting link between the new church and the old ; and if his consecration be not absolutely certain, the validity of the ordinations of the English Church is, to say the least, not absolutely certain, at least as far as he is concerned. Whether the other bishops, whose record of consecration no longer appears, were, or were not, consecrated, is a matter of comparatively minor importance ; but it is of most serious importance for the Anglicans, to establish, by positive proof, that the man through whom they claim orders, had himself received them. Besides, it does not appear that the consecration of these other bishops was ever questioned ; whereas that of Barlow has been constantly denied.

Barlow was elected bishop of St. Asaph's, in the early part of 1535 ; although it is not easy to fix with certainty the date of his election, as the Royal act for his confirmation, dated on the 22d of February of that year, has not, in Rymer, the usual marks of an authentic instrument, before so often referred to. According to Godwin, he was consecrated on the 22d of February, 1535,† but this is irrecon-

\* See Letter of Right Rev. Dr. Milner, to Dr. Elrington, in the Appendix.

† p. 663.

cileable with what is mentioned by Wharton, and the author of the "*Fasti Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*," who place his confirmation, which naturally precedes the consecration, on the 23d of February, 1535.\* Strype assigns the 15th of September, 1535, as the day of his confirmation.† All these contradictions are evidence that nothing certain is known of the period of Barlow's consecration; and they are all contradicted by an authentic Royal Act of the 29th of May, 1536, by which the Chapter of St. Asaph's obtained permission to proceed to the election of a new bishop for that see, vacant,—*per liberam transmutationem Will. Barlow ultimi episcopi ibidem ELECTI*,—that is, *by the voluntary EXCHANGE of William Barlow, the last bishop ELECT of that place.*‡ Hence, it appears that he was never consecrated for St. Asaph's; for not only is he styled "ELECT," but his removal is called an "EXCHANGE" (*transmutatio*), whereas, had he been consecrated for St. Asaph's, it would have been termed a "TRANSLATION" (*translatio*). Of this Courayer was so fully aware, that he renders the word "*transmutationem*," by "*translation*,"—a fraud which fully proves the importance he attached to this expression of the Royal writ. Indeed, among the documents which are found annexed to this writer's vindication of the English orders, we find one communicated to him by an English advocate of the same cause, in which it is ex-

\* p. 27.

† Memorials of Archbishop Cranmer. Book I. c. ix. p. 37.

‡ The difference of phrase will appear more remarkable when contrasted with the following words of a Royal act, authorizing the election of a bishop of London, after Grindall, who had filled that see, had been *translated* to York: "*Per translationem ultimi Episcopi ad Archiepiscopatum Eborum.*"—Rymer XV. 681.



pressly stated, that Barlow was *not* consecrated for St. Asaph's.\*

As a proof of Barlow's consecration, the mandate, dated 22d Feb., 1536, of King Henry to Cranmer, empowering him to perform that ceremony, is adduced; and as by law the bishop to whom such a mandate was directed, was obliged to proceed to execute it, within twenty days after it issued, it is inferred that Barlow must have been consecrated within that time. But it is to be remarked that this mandate, as found in Rymer, has not the sign of authenticity so often referred to,—*Per breve de privato sigillo, or per ipsum Regem*;† and from the acknowledged fact of the frequency with which public records were forged and altered, during the reign of Elizabeth, this must be regarded as a *sine qua non* to establish the authenticity of a public document. According to Strype, he was confirmed—a ceremony necessarily consequent on the royal mandate for consecration—on the 15th of September, 1535,‡—just five months before the date of the supposed order for his consecration. In fact, the most earnest advocate for the

\* Tres solummodo episcopos observavi, qui, his ducentis annis proxime elapsis, ad secundas sedes transierint, antequam ad priores consecrati fuissent. Horum primum est BARLOWIUS ille de quo hic agitur. ("I have observed only three bishops, within the last two hundred years, who have been translated to new sees, without having been consecrated for those to which they were first elected. Of these this Barlow, of whom there is question, is the first.")—Appendix to Courayer, p. 389.

† Rymer, XIV. 550.

‡ Strype's *Memorials of Cranmer*, L. I. c. ix. p. 37. To understand how September could come before February, it is necessary to remind the reader that, at the period referred to, the year commenced in England, on the 25th of March, and not on the 1st of January.

validity of English orders, has nothing but a mere conjecture to support him in asserting the fact of his consecration for St. Asaph. His words are : “ Barlow was *confirmed* bishop of St. Asaph, on the 23d of February, 1535. He was then absent from the city, being occupied in the King’s business out of the kingdom. Hence, his confirmation was made by means of a proxy, and he himself, PROBABLY, consecrated in the country, by virtue of the Archbishop’s commission.”\*—“ Hence, although we know with certainty that he was confirmed, and, *as it is reasonable to suppose*, also consecrated, yet nothing further appears with regard to the see of St. Asaph.”† Add to all this, that there is no record of any episcopal act being performed by him in that see.‡

The reason why Barlow resigned the see of St. Asaph’s, to which he was elected, is stated to have been the poverty of that diocese, mentioned by Godwin as one of the poorest in England.§ He was named theologian to the embassy which Henry VIII. sent into Scotland, in order to prevail on David, King of that country, to join with the English monarch in his separation from Rome. A manuscript

\* Barlovius confirmatus fuit episcopus Assavensis, 23 die Feb. anno. 1535. Absens tum erat ab urbe, in regiis negotiis extra regnum occupatus. Hinc confirmatio ejus per procuratorem facta, et ipse *verisimiliter* vigore commissionis archiepiscopalis ruri consecratus.— p. 376.

† Sequitur eum quantumvis re ipsa ut certo scimus confirmatum, et, *ut par est credere*, etiam consecratum; respectu tamen sedis As-savensis, nihil amplius. Appendix to Courayer, p. 377.

‡ Neque aliquid ab illo in eo episcopatu actum, quod in registrum inseri debuit. Ib.

§ Godwin, p. 664.

entitled "Speculum Protestantismi," written by a grand-nephew of Barlow, who had become a Catholic, and cited by Courayer, says, "that he was never bishop of St. Asaph's." And John Bale places him FIRST at St. David's before his translation to Bath.\* Lord Herbert in noticing his mission to Scotland, expressly calls him bishop ELECT of St. Asaph's. All that has been hitherto said, proves that it is, at least, very uncertain, whether he was ever consecrated for St. Asaph's, and this is confirmed by the date *assigned* for his passing to the see of St. David's. Richard Rawlins, the former bishop of St. David's, died on the 18th of February, 1535, and on the 10th of the following April,—just six weeks after the act of Barlow's *confirmation* to St. Asaph's, he is said to have been elected to the see of St. David's, not yet having been consecrated for that of St. Asaph's.†

That Barlow was made bishop of St. David's by Henry VIII., is generally believed; nor do I deny that such was the case, although there are strong reasons for calling this fact into question. Some think that as the embassy to Scotland proved unsuccessful, Barlow was disappointed in his expectation of promotion. It is certain that by a Royal Act of the 3d of February, 1548, which is undoubtedly authentic, being *Per Breve de privato sigillo*, the see of Bath and Wells, was conferred on William, bishop of St. David's;‡ but as the name of Barlow is not mentioned, this document cannot be regarded as a positive proof that the individual there named was William Barlow, although

\* Et factus est *primum* sub Henrico VIII., Menevensis; postea sub Eduardo VI. Anglorum regibus, Bathensis ac Wellensis episcopus.

† Courayer, Appendix, p. 377.

‡ Rymer, XV. p. 169.

Godwin maintains that it was. In the Act of nomination of Ferrar to the see of St. David, this is said to be vacant "by the translation of William;" but it does not add "Barlow." The arguments derived from these two authentic acts are, consequently, not absolutely conclusive.

Now there appears something very like positive proof that Barlow was not bishop of St. David's, in the years 1536, and 1541. In the writs for the convocation of Parliament, in these years, the bishop of St. David's is indicated by the initial of his surname, "T.," which, if relied on, would show that Barlow, whose name was "William," was not then bishop of that see. In order to remove this difficulty, so destructive of the hypothesis he was labouring to establish, and, at the same time, to find a proof where he should have removed an objection, Courayer suppressed the "T." in both instances, and cited these two writs to prove that Barlow was bishop of St. David's!!! When detected in this disgraceful attempt to falsify a public document, he endeavoured to excuse himself by adducing a multiplicity of reasons to prove that the "T." of the two commissions had been erroneously put for W.! What likelihood is there that the *same* mistake, if mistake it be, should occur in two official documents, written after the interval of five years?—A cause that requires such artifice and fraud in its defence, must needs be bad.\*

All the royal acts in which Barlow is named bishop of St. David's, or of Bath and Wells, are without the stamp

\* Courayer's English Translator, the answerer of Ward, has been somewhat more honest than the French writer. He gives the initial "T." in the writ of convocation for the Parliament of 1536; but omits it in the writ of 1541; although it is given by Rymer, in both instances! This, I suppose, was done on the golden principle of Anglicanism, preserving a *via media* between truth and falsehood.

of authenticity so often before referred to, none of them being marked by Rymer—*Per Breve de privato sigillo*; and are, of course,—if not destitute of all weight,—at least, not conclusive evidence. The collection of Rymer contains no act of his election or nomination to any bishopric,—no *Regius assensus*, nor commission for consecration, after his resignation of the see of St. Asaph; and although he is mentioned as having been bishop of St. David's, Bath and Wells, in the "*Speculum Protestantismi*," published in 1640, by his own grand-nephew, as before stated, this testimony is evidently too weak to produce conviction. In a word, I have not met with any *certain* proof that he was bishop, either under Henry or Edward; although I incline to believe, that at least, under the latter, he may have been bishop of Bath and Wells.\* It is true, indeed, that he is generally supposed to have been the bishop of St. David, who assisted in the convocation, held under Henry, in 1536; nor do I wish to be understood as positively denying such to have been the case. But although he is mentioned in the preface, and his name appears among the subscriptions of those who were present at that convocation, there is reason to suppose that the subscriptions to the acts, as well as the preface, under the name of Henry VIII., were added in the reign of James I. It appears certain that they were not in the original edition of the acts.†

\* The older historians of the reformation seem to have had greater difficulties in finding the date of Barlow's translation to Bath and Wells than those who wrote half a century after them. "He" (Barlow) "was translated to this see" (Bath and Wells), "on the death of Knight, but the precise day and time thereof I have no where found." Heylin, p. 54.

† See Hardouin, in answer to Courayer, p. 325.

On the authority of an English correspondent, whose Latin letters are given in the appendix to his work, Courayer asserted "that Barlow subscribed the acts of the convocations held in 1536, 1537, 1540, and 1552, and that in all of these, he acted as a bishop with other bishops ; and that he is *never* designated by any other title than that of bishop of St. David's."\* The learned Hardouin very justly remarked, that this proved that Barlow was bishop of St. David's in 1552,—whereas his translation to the see of Bath and Wells, is placed in the year 1548. This anachronism could not be defended ; and, accordingly, Courayer, in his reply to Hardouin, endeavoured to remove the difficulty on the authority of *another* letter from his English correspondent, who had most unaccountably fallen into a mistake by inserting the word "St. David's,"—Menevensis—where no such word was found in the subscription to the convocation of 1552 ! What, then, was found, may it be asked ? Simply, the word "Episcopus" (bishop). The removal of the word "Menevensis," from the extract given in the note at the bottom of the page, will give the passage such as it ought to have originally stood ! But, in this case, these subscriptions do not prove that Barlow had any more than the title of bishop, and this is all that is given him in the commission of 9th September, 1559 ; and neither this title, nor his presence in these several synods, *if present*, can for a moment be supposed necessarily to imply his consecration.

That on her accession to the throne, Mary deprived the bishop of Bath and Wells of his see, is certain from the

\* IN HIS OMNIBUS cum reliquis episcopis tanquam episcopus egit : neque alio quam EPISCOPI MENEVENENSIS nomine PERPETUO indigitatur. p. 386. Courayer. Appendix.

records given by Rymer; but that that bishop was William Barlow, although generally believed, does not appear to be certainly established. There is, indeed, a degree of obscurity about this portion of Barlow's history,—if he were in reality the bishop so deprived—which it is extremely difficult to clear up. In the royal and authentic act nominating Bourne to Bath and Wells, *Per ipsam Reginam*, the see is said to be vacant “by the deprivation and removal of the last bishop of that place;” \* whereas, according to the writ issued by Bourne for the temporalities of his sec,—which writ is *not* either *Per breve de privato sigillo*, or *Per ipsam Reginam*, and therefore of doubtful authority—the vacancy is attributed to the “free and voluntary resignation of the last bishop of that place.” When it is considered that but fifteen days intervened between the dates of these commissions, this difference of style will appear very remarkable; and is of itself sufficient evidence that one or other of them is supposititious.

Not only was Barlow deprived, or forced by circumstances to make a voluntary resignation of his sec, according to the defenders of Anglican ordinations; he was more-

\* Rymer, xv. 173—74. The copy of this writ, given in the appendix to Courayer (pa. 368,) has the name of Barlow foisted in after the words—*per deprivationem et amotionem ultimi episcopi ibidem*—(Wil. Barlow)—although neither of these two last words occurs in the writ as given in Rymer from which it is said to be taken. Any one that reads the document in Courayer, would immediately conclude that it is an *exact* copy of the original; and as the act is of undoubted authenticity—*Per ipsum Reginam*—would be inclined to regard this as a demonstration that Barlow was bishop of Bath and Wells, in 1554. The parenthesis-mark would not suggest to one in a thousand a doubt on the subject; while, in the event of detection, it affords something like the shadow of an excuse for this barefaced imposture. *Ex pede Herculem!*

over, according to the same authorities, cast into prison, where, like Cranmer, he renounced the errors of Protestantism, in order to save his life.\* To show his zeal in the defence of the ancient faith, he republished a book which he had formerly given to the world, entitled, "A Dialogue describing the original ground of these Lutheran factions, and many of their abuses ; compyled by Syr William Barlowe, Chanon, late Bishop of Bath," and which bears date London 1553. In a new preface he prefixed to this work "he depicts the reformers,"—says the writer of the Latin letters, in the appendix to Courayer's Defence,—"in the worst colours, and attacks them with furious bitterness."†

It may, however, be very reasonably doubted whether Barlow was guilty of this weakness. Burnet hesitates to admit the authenticity of the work thus attributed to him.‡ It is not given among his works by Bale, or whoever gave under his name the catalogue of the British writers, which was published, or rather appears on the face of it to have been published, in Basle, in 1557,§ and although it is

\* *Barlovius interim adhuc in carcere custoditus, ut a mortis periculo se liberaret, nullum non lapidem movit, nec dubitavit etiam cum conscientie jactura saluti suæ consulere.* App. Courayer, p. 388.

† *Cum præfatione nova ad lectores contra reformatores, quos determinis coloribus editor depingit, et furiosa rabie acriter perstringit.* Ib. p. 389.

‡ Burnet. *Hist. of the Ref.* T. 3. app. p. 415.

§ Bale. *Gulielmus Barlow*, Cent. 9. c. xli. p. 715.—Hardouin says that this work is antedated, and that it first appeared, among other literary frauds, in the reign of James I. Whether this be the case or not, it was not published in 1557, the date which it bears, both in the preface, and at the end of the work ; as it is dedicated to Queen Elizabeth, who did not ascend the throne until the November of 1558. There is another



stated to have been his production by his great grand nephew in 1610, this proof is evidently not very satisfactory. To some it has appeared as one of the many ingenious devices resorted to, for the purpose of working out the very difficult problem of Barlow's episcopacy.

It is urged in support of Barlow's episcopal character, that he is mentioned as bishop of St. David's, among the prelates who officiated at the obsequies of Henry VIII. But as Strype is the first who mentions the circumstance,—one hundred and eighty years after the death of Henry VIII.. it cannot be relied on as a demonstrative proof.

It is said, in support of Barlow's supposed consecration, that he appears to have been regarded as a bishop, by his contemporaries, who were the best judges of the matter, and who, unquestionably, would not have recognized him as such, had he not been consecrated. To this it may be replied, 1st, that the fact of his having been so regarded depends on the value of the proofs above adduced, which in my mind are any thing but conclusive; and 2dly, If he were looked on as a bishop, who had been consecrated by Crammer in the time of Henry VIII., and if he consecrated Parker at Lambeth, as is pretended, the fact of Parker's consecration would never have been called in question by these Catholic theologians, who publicly asserted that this latter had been consecrated *sine ulla cerimonia*. Would not the inference then, that either Barlow was never consecrated, or that he never consecrated Parker at Lambeth, be much more fairly deduced from this certain fact.

anachronism regarding the death of Tunstal, bishop of Durham, which, in this supposed work of Bale, is assigned to the year 1556: but we know that Tunstal was not deprived before 1559, and that his death occurred in the latter part of this year. This edition of Bale may be seen in the Loganian Library, Philadelphia.

than the consecration of Barlow be inferred from the suspicious evidence by which it is attempted to be proved that he passed for a bishop.

These are the principal reasons adduced to prove that Barlow was bishop of St. David's, and, subsequently of Bath and Wells, in the reign of Henry VIII. The reader will determine for himself whether they are conclusive or otherwise; and whether the exceptions taken to them are to be classed with the difficulties of captious spirits.

Supposing, however, that Barlow was in possession of the bishopric of St. David's, and subsequently of Bath and Wells, does it therefore follow that he was consecrated? Certainly not. He himself publicly preached that the King's nomination was sufficient to make a bishop, without any consecration,—a doctrine, says Dr. Milner, that seems to have been intended to meet the objection that he himself had never been consecrated. Courayer acknowledges that “Barlow was accused of heresy for denying the necessity of consecration.” With such sentiments, it was by no means difficult for him to elude the law requiring his consecration,—especially when he had *exchanged* his first bishopric without having been consecrated, as I have already established. At a time when the ordinary course of things had been interrupted by the national apostacy, and when the chapters of the different cathedrals, were merely the registers of the tyrant's will; when the Primate of England, and the bishops assembled in convocation, could publicly profess the doctrine, that it was of *necessity* that the apostles made bishops, as they lacked the ordinary power so to do, *not having a Christian King* among them!—to suppose that Barlow could have

had any serious difficulty in passing for bishop, although not really such, is to manifest a want of acquaintance with the character of the man and of the times in which he lived.

The argument in favor of Barlow's consecration, drawn from the supposed fact that he sat in parliament is, according to Courayer himself, "not absolutely demonstrative."\* I say, *supposed* fact; because, as the reader has seen (in pa. 141) the strongest proof of his having actually done so is supplied by the ingenuity of Courayer himself, who, of course, for sufficient reasons, changed the 'T,' of the Royal writ of convocation into 'W'! Neither is the suing out of the temporalities for the see of St. David's, even if established, an irrefragable proof that he was consecrated; since Courayer confesses, that "the Kings of England often dispensed with this usage,"†—namely, that which required that consecration should precede such an act. "Mr. Stevens, a protestant minister,"—says Mr. Husenbeth, in his excellent work, 'Faberism exposed,'—"in his *Great Question*, records several instances in the reign of Henry VIII., of bishops elect being invested with their temporalities previous to consecration. Stokesley, bishop of London, received his temporalities July 14, 1530, and was not consecrated till the following November. Bonner, elected to the see of Hereford, received his temporalities by his proctor, while he was out of England; and when afterwards elected to London, was invested with temporalities, Nov. 18, 1539, and yet was not consecrated until the April following.‡ If such investitures could be procured

\* p. 54.      † p. 54.

‡ This assertion of Mr. Stevens, in which he follows Courayer, who follows Godwin, is denied by Hardouin, on what appears to be very

from Henry for these prelates, why not equally for his favourite Barlow? ‘Nor is it more strange,’—observes Mr. Stevens,—‘that of all the acts necessary for that purpose, the consecration should be omitted, *especially at a time when it was set so light by*, than that of all the

sufficient grounds. Bonner was nominated to the see of Hereford in 1538; and on the 27th of November of that year, the King’s commission—*Per Breve de privato sigillo*—issued to Cranmer for his consecration (Rymer T. xiv. p. 599).—According to the statute of Henry VIII., before referred to, the consecration should take place within twenty days. Why then delay the consecration for eighteen months?—In the act restoring the temporalities of the see of London to him, after his translation to that see, Cranmer is only said to have *confirmed* him; there is no mention made of his supposed consecration on this occasion. (Rymer, xiv. p. 650.) And although in the commission for his installation into the see of London—*Per Breve de privato sigillo*—his Metropolitan is commanded to do all that was on his part necessary—in consecratione, confirmatione, et installatione predicti electi,—these words are evidently the usual phraseology of such documents, and by no means can be taken as proof that Bonner was not yet consecrated. In fact, Godwin contradicts his own assertion with regard to Bonner’s consecration; for he says:—“In Londinensi Ecclesia per *installationem* collocatur, Aprilis 3, 1540,”—and does not make any mention of his consecration. Indeed, his consecration could not have taken place on that day, it being the Saturday before Low Sunday. This oversight of Godwin, however, has been corrected by the industry of Courayer, who takes the *installation* for the *consecration* of Barlow, and as the latter ceremony should have occurred on a Sunday, changes the 3d into the 4th of April!—There is, indeed, another commission for the installation of Bonner into the see of London, in which Cranmer is ordered—*consecrare, ipsumque, prout moris est episcopalis insigniis investire*—(to consecrate, and, as is the custom, invest him with the episcopal insignia,) but this commission is *not*,—*Per breve de privato sigillo*: and, therefore, not conclusive proof.—Besides, the fact that Bonner

records and entries of those acts, *that* only of the consecration, if there had been any, should be wanting.”<sup>k</sup>

In a word, although Barlow passed for a bishop in Henry and Edward's time, it does not follow that he was really such. We have in the cases of Latimer and Ridley, an instance of persons who had passed for bishops, and yet had never been consecrated. The words of Dr. Brooke, bishop of Gloucester, when he was about to degrade Ridley, previously to his being delivered over to the hands of the secular power, show that he was a mere priest:—“ We must against our willes proceed, according to our commission, to degrading, taking from you the dignitie of priesthood ; for we take you for no bishop.” Had Ridley been actually consecrated, according to the Roman Pontifical, as Cranmer's supposed register would make appear, would such language have been used ? Most certainly not.<sup>†</sup>

was consecrated before his translation to London, is also established by public acts bearing his name as bishop of Hereford and of London, several months previous to his supposed consecration, in April 1540. This part of Mr. Stevenson's argument can, consequently, be only used by those who adopt this opinion, as an *argumentum ad hominem* ; and thus applied, the consequence he deduces from it, cannot be rejected by those who believe Bonner's translation to have occurred before his consecration.

\* p. 533.

† See Collier, part 11. Vol. 6. London Ed. 1840. From this it appears that Latimer and Ridley were only degraded from priests' orders, although in the commission of Cardinal Pole, they are styled bishops. Collier endeavours to account for this circumstance, by saying that Latimer had resigned his see in the reign of Henry VIII., thrown off his episcopal habit, and pretended no farther to the title. The cause of the non-allowance of Ridley's episcopal character, was, he thinks, because his consecration had taken place after the separation

The preceding observations render it manifest, that even in the supposition that Barlow was named to the see of St. David's, by Henry VIII., and subsequently transferred to Bath and Wells, it does not necessarily follow, that he was consecrated; and from what has been already stated, as well as what yet remains to be mentioned, it ap-

of England from the see of Rome; and that, therefore, all such consecrations were regarded as invalid by the Catholic clergy. Neither of these explanations can be admitted. Once a priest or bishop, for ever one; and with regard to the case of Ridley, it is sufficient to say that the opinion gratuitously attributed to the English Catholic clergy had been, for many ages before, exploded as erroneous. But we are not left to our own assertion on this subject. We have the express declaration of Cardinal Pole, in the direction given by him to the Chapter of Canterbury, on the 8th Jan. 1555, whereby he empowered that body to reconcile to the church, those who had fallen away in the two preceding reigns. In this document he expressly states that such persons, "notwithstanding irregularity and other impediments, might continue to minister at the altar, in their respective orders, even when received from heretical and schismatical bishops, although irregularly—provided, however, that in their collation, the due form and intention were observed."—*Quodque irregularitate et aliis præmissis non obstantibus, in suis ordinibus etiam ab hæreticis et schismaticis episcopis, etiam minus rite, dummodo in eorum collatione ecclesiastica forma et intentio sit servata, per eos susceptis,—etiam in altaris ministerio ministrare possint.*"—(Memorials of Cranmer. Appendix, p. 188.) The cause assigned by Collier is, then, untenable. A much more likely cause of Dr. Brooke's conduct was, probably, the fact, that they had neglected to receive episcopal consecration. This, indeed, seems undeniable, with regard to Ridley, who was nominated for Rochester under Henry VIII., but was not consecrated, according to Dr. Heylin, until the 5th of September 1547, under Edward VI. History of the Reformation, p. 53. Collier himself styles him *elect* of Rochester, in his account of the obsequies of Francis I. under Edward VI. V. 5 pa. 203.

pears exceedingly probable that he never was. It must always, however, be borne in mind that my design is not so much to prove that Barlow was *not* consecrated, as to show that there is no satisfactory evidence to warrant us in believing that he *was*.

Now there are some very stubborn facts to show that Barlow was not consecrated, previously to the commission of the 9th of September. In the account of the service performed on that day in St. Paul's, at London, Parker is mentioned as the officiating prelate, although all acknowledge that he was then only *elect*. Barlow and Scory assisted him. Is there any likelihood that they would have assisted a bishop *elect*, had they themselves been really consecrated? The only exception to the general custom of making those in inferior orders assist those in higher orders, and not *vice versa*, is in the case of the Cardinal priests, who, on account of their dignity as Cardinals, are occasionally assisted by bishops. But we are not left to mere inference on this occasion. I have already cited the words of Stowe, who expressly states, that "Doctor Parker, archbishoppe of Cantorburie elect, Doctor Barlow, Bishoppe of Chichester elect, Doctor Scorey, Bishoppe of Hereford elect," performed the ceremony. We are not warranted by the context in supposing that Barlow and Scory were *elect* in any other sense than Parker.

The commission of the 9th September, is directed to Barlow and Scory along with four Catholic bishops. This does not prove that these two last named were consecrated bishops; as the only object the Queen seems to have had in view in joining them with the Catholic prelates, was, that they might be authentic witnesses of Parker's consecration, which she hoped the Catholic bishops might

be induced to perform. So far from supplying a proof of their episcopal character, it, on the contrary, affords some very plausible grounds for calling it into question.

1. Barlow and Scory are merely styled "bishops;" whereas, as before remarked, the Catholic prelates have the title of their respective sees attached to their names. Moreover, in the supposed commission of 6th Dec. 1559, Barlow is not merely styled bishop, but "formerly bishop of Bath, now elect of Chichester,"—and Scory, "formerly bishop of Chester, now elect of Hereford." This is the style that we should find in the *really* genuine commission of the 9th of September. If both commissions be authentic, as the defenders of Anglican Ordinations contend, how are we to account for this remarkable difference of expression?

2. If Barlow had been consecrated in the reign of Henry VIII. it seems most probable that Queen Elizabeth would have been crowned by him, instead of, as before mentioned, subjecting herself to the mortification of the refusal she received from the Catholic bishops, or obliging herself to swear, as she did at her coronation, to maintain the Catholic Religion, which she had already determined to extirpate from her kingdom. Indeed, we are not left to our mere inferences on this subject. Dr. Heylin in endeavouring to solve this difficulty, mentions only "three bishops, of *King Edward's making*,"\* as then alive, who were friendly to the reformation. Had Barlow been one of the bishops consecrated in Henry's reign, would not he also have been mentioned in addition to these three? The fact of the matter appears to be, either that he was one of the three, or had as yet received no form of consecration.

\* Heylin, Hist. of Eliz. p. 106.



3. If Barlow were really a bishop, especially as he is supposed to have been consecrated according to the Roman pontifical, it is not likely that Elizabeth would have applied to the Catholic bishops, in the case of Parker, and thus exposed herself, on a most important occasion, to the mortification of a refusal on their part. Were he a bishop, Landaff, whose unwillingness must have been known, would not have been named in the supposed commission of the 6th of December. Indeed, the delay in the consecration of Parker cannot be explained, if we suppose that Barlow, not to say any thing of Scory and others, whose names are mentioned, was really a bishop. The only reason assigned by Courayer for this extraordinary delay, is, that perhaps it was difficult to find bishops willing and capable to perform the ceremony.

4. If Barlow were consecrated for St. Asaph's or St. David's, he must have been the *senior* of Landaff, whose consecration was of comparatively recent date : hence he would be named before Landaff in the royal commission. It follows from this, that either Barlow was never consecrated ; or that the commission of the 6th of December is a spurious document.

5. In the conference held between the Catholic and Protestant theologians, in the commencement of Elizabeth's reign, Scory is the only bishop on the Protestant side, although there were several bishops on the part of the Catholics.<sup>1</sup> Were Barlow a bishop, or did he even pass for one, should we not expect to find him present on this occasion ? This observation of itself, indeed, *proves* nothing ; but, taken with the other circumstances of his

\* Heylin, Elizabeth, 112.

case, it is evidently unfavourable to the supposition of his consecration.

To remove these difficulties, it is said that as Barlow and Scory were bishops deprived of their sees, and, therefore not recognized by the law as such, it was more in accordance with the requisitions of the law, and more agreeably to the established order, that bishops who were in actual possession should be preferred to them. Although I am not by any means satisfied with this solution of the difficulty, I leave it to the judgment of the reader without further observation.

I trust that those who have weighed impartially the contents of this chapter, will not think the conclusions to which this examination of Barlow's episcopal character has led me, rash and unfounded. All are agreed that Barlow's consecration cannot be established by *positive* evidence; and may, at most, be inferred from the circumstances of his history. In other words; the fact is not CERTAIN: but according to the most sanguine advocates of English orders, HIGHLY PROBABLE! The circumstances principally relied on to establish the fact, are all, or, at least, many of them, liable to much controversy; and render it in my mind still *more highly probable* that the consecrator of Parker was never himself consecrated. The famous distich, by which the Episcopal Methodists are so perseveringly taunted, may, then, be applied, mutatis mutandis, to those very persons, who put the question:—

“ Our John on Coke his hands has laid,  
But who laid hands on him ? ”——

## CHAPTER XI.

On the form appointed to be used by the Ordinal of Edward VI.

AT the period of the Reformation in England, in the reign of Edward VI., the forms by which bishops and priests had been theretofore ordained were altered, in order to adapt them to the new doctrines. These doctrines were, as I have already shown, highly derogatory to the powers of the ministry; the bishops, and of course, all their subordinates, were considered as little better than the King's "ecclesiastical sheriffs."\* The substitution of the word "elder" instead of "priest," in Acts, c. xv. 2.; Ep. Titus, c. i. 5; 1 Tim. c. iv. 16; c. v. 17, 19; St. James, c. v. 14, in three different editions of the Bible, in 1562, 1577, and 1579, shows that not only was the idea of priesthood studiously kept out of view, but that these supposed translations of the Word were nothing more than the vehicle for the errors of men. "In nothing," says Dr. Milner, "does Cranmer's spirit of Presbyterianism appear so plain as in his form of consecrating bishops."—Indeed, as the same distinguished divine has remarked, the form, as used previous to 1662, is just as proper for

\* That this is not an exaggerated phrase, may be seen from the testimony of Heylin, in Chapter II., p. 29. Henry VIII. was in the habit of issuing commissions to the bishops, empowering them to consecrate churches. See Rymer, XIV. p. 767, et alibi.

the ceremony of confirming, or laying hands upon children, as it is for conferring the powers of the episcopacy. The form of ordaining priests, as will be hereafter shown, labours under a similar defect: but before proceeding to the examination of these forms, it may not be entirely useless, to make a few preliminary observations.

1. The Catholic Church does not believe that the effect of a valid form can be frustrated by the errors and disbelief of those who use it, or of the society in which it is employed. The Church has, accordingly, always admitted the validity of the ordinations of the Greek schismatical Church, because conferred by persons who themselves had been ordained, and, who, in conferring orders, preserve the ancient form of ordination. Hence, if she deems the English ordinations invalid, it must be, either because she denies the fact of their having been performed by a regularly ordained minister, or because she judges that the form used on the occasion is insufficient.

2. The Church has uniformly rejected the English ordinations as invalid. All the Catholic bishops of England, in the time of Queen Mary, unanimously condemned the form which had been introduced under Edward VI., and their decision was confirmed by the judgment of the Catholic world. We accordingly find that those bishops who had been consecrated according to that form, were regarded as invalidly consecrated; and even their civil acts were annulled by the courts of law, during the reign of that Queen. The Catholic doctors of those times regarded that form as invalid. This was publicly declared by Richard Bristow, in a book written in the year 1567, to which reference has already been made; and it has ever since been the sentiment of the Church, which has uniformly considered as mere laymen, whatever bishops.

ministers, etc., of the English clergy, have returned to her communion, and confers on them, as such, the orders of priesthood, etc., should they be disposed to embrace the ecclesiastical state. This was at length solemnly ordered by a decree of the Roman Inquisition, made in the presence of Clement VI., on the 27th of April, 1701.

The nature of the changes made in the form of ordination, and the grounds of the exceptions taken to it, by the Catholics of Queen Mary's time, are thus detailed by Dodd:—

“When this ordinal” (that of Edward VI.) “was examined, in the next ensuing reign of Queen Mary, it was declared to be insufficient and invalid, as to the purposes of consecrating a true ministry, both the bishops and parliament being of that opinion. The reasons, in general, of its insufficiency, were an essential defect, both as to the matter and form of the episcopal and sacerdotal orders. There was no anointing—a ceremony always made use of from the earliest times, without which the ordination was doubted, and, according to the common opinion, invalid. There was no porrection of instruments, another significative ceremony, generally esteemed to be essential. But, what was still of the greatest moment, there was no form of words, specifying the order that was conferred; and particularly no words or ceremony made use of to express the power of absolving and offering sacrifice. For these, and several other reasons, which I have distinctly mentioned in another place, all the orders conferred according to this new ordinal, were looked upon by the Catholics in Queen Mary's reign, to be null and invalid.”\*

\* Dodd's Church History, quoted by the editor of Collier's Ecclesiastical History. Vol. 5, p. 301.

3. The rejection of English ordinations by the Church, is grounded solely on the insufficiency of the form; and not upon any historical fact, such as whether Matthew Parker was, or was not, consecrated by Barlow, or whether Barlow himself was, or was not, a regularly consecrated bishop. Whatever opinion may be formed on each of these much disputed facts,—and every Catholic is at perfect liberty to affirm or deny them,—still the judgment and practice of the Church is exclusively founded on the nature of the form, which, being insufficient of itself, suffices to invalidate the act of which it is so essential a part, no matter by whom performed.

4. The insufficiency of the form of Edward VI. has been constantly maintained by Catholic writers in their disputes with Anglicans; and seems to have been virtually acknowledged by the church of England itself. In the year 1662, while the Convocation of the clergy was sitting, a learned convert from Protestantism, the Rev. John Lewgar, published a tract on the ordination controversy, called *Erastus Senior*, in which he argued powerfully against the vague form of ordination, which had been, up to that time, used in the Anglican ordinations. These objections turned principally on the point, that there was nothing in the form of consecrating bishops, which expressed the office or character of the episcopacy; and that the form of the ordination of priests omitted what was the essence of the priestly character—the power to offer sacrifice. Whether or not it was in consequence of his reasons, or from a general conviction of the defectiveness of the form theretofore used, or,—as Bishop Burnet affirms,—to meet the objections of the Presbyterians; certain it is, that the Convocation CHANGED the

form, which had been used for upwards of one hundred years; and that the change, especially in regard to the episcopal consecration, was precisely such as determined the rite to confer the episcopal character, as may be seen by comparing the forms of Edward VI., with those adopted by the Convocation in 1662.

#### THE FORM OF ORDAINING PRIESTS.

*Devised (for this is the word), by K. Edward VI.*

Receive the Holy Ghost, whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven: and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the word of God, and of his holy sacraments: In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

#### THE FORM OF CONSECRATING BISHOPS.

*Devised by Edward VI.*

“Take the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up the grace of God, which is in thee by the imposition of hands; for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and soberness.”

*The form of ordaining priests made by the Convocation after the restoration of King Charles II., in 1662.*

“Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou shalt forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the word of God and of his holy sacraments, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.”

*The form of consecrating bishops made in the same year, 1662.*

“Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a bishop in the Church of God, committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands; in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. And remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is given thee by this imposition of our hands: for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and soberness.”

With regard to these two forms, I have to remark that the changes of 1662 evidently *aim* at supplying the defect pointed out by Catholic divines: whether they fully do so, or not, is not the subject of the present examination, and, therefore, may be passed over.

If the forms “devised” by Edward VI., were sufficient, the Convocation of 1662 by changing them, especially in those points in which their validity had been assailed, inflicted a wound on the character of English orders, which it will be extremely difficult to heal or remove. If the forms of Edward VI., were not sufficient, the change came one hundred and three years too LATE! Hence, whichever opinion be adopted, the validity of English orders has been most seriously compromised by those who should have maintained it.

5. Although it is no part of the present investigation to ascertain or establish the sacrificial character of the Eucharist, yet as some of the argumentation which follows, is grounded on the supposition that the Eucharist is a sacrifice, it is necessary to state that a large body of Anglican divines, especially those who admit the necessity of apostolic succession, have maintained, especially in our days, that the Eucharist is a sacrifice, and that its minis-



ters are properly called priests. I will give, in the language of an Anglican bishop, Overall, what may be regarded as the exposition of the sentiments of the class of English protestants above referred to:—"As there never was, nor could be, any religion without a God, so there never was, nor could be any without a sacrifice, being one of the chiefest acts whereby we profess our religion to Him that we serve."\* Another divine of the Anglican communion, Buckeridge, thus expresses the same truth, as also the necessary relation which exists between a priesthood and a sacrifice. "This sacrament," says he, "is the only proper external sacrifice of the Church, without which the other two relatives cannot stand; viz: that there is no religion without priesthood, nor priesthood without sacrifice."†

6. It is also agreed upon that the form or words used in ordination, by which the grace of the priestly character is conveyed, should be adapted to express the nature and object of the rite which is performed. The Anglicans place the essence of ordination in the imposition of hands and in such an invocation of the Holy Ghost as will point out and define, or at least indicate, the leading characters of the office to be conferred. The opinion expressed in the first of the Oxford Tracts which denies that "the grace of ordination is contained in the laying on of hands, not in any form of words," is singular and novel; and so obviously opposed to the practice of the universal church, as to be untenable by any one who seriously professes to adopt the principles which christian antiquity recognized.

\* Overall, Oxford Tracts. Vol. IV. Tract 81, p. 73. London Edition.

† Buckeridge, Discourse concerning kneeling at the Communion Oxford Tracts, Vol. IV. Tract 81, p. 87.

I now proceed to show that the forms as devised by Edward VI., were insufficient for the conferring the priestly or episcopal character.

The power of offering sacrifice is what essentially constitutes the character of priest. A deacon may baptize, preach the word, and, in certain cases, *administer* the Sacrament of the Eucharist, although he cannot *consecrate* it. I have already shown that some modern Anglicans, following the footsteps of many of those who lived in the seventeenth century, have admitted the Eucharist to be a sacrifice: and, indeed, otherwise, they could not, consistently with the propriety of language, call themselves priests, as they occasionally do. Many other divines of the same communion deny this, and regard the Eucharist merely as a commemoration of Christ's sacrifice, without, however attributing to it any sacrificial character. I do not, of course, propose to examine the relative merits of these opinions; but it is necessary to draw attention to the fact, that the Eucharist is never called a sacrifice, either in the Thirty-nine Articles of Queen Elizabeth, or in the second book of *Common Prayer*, published in King Edward's reign, in which it is merely termed the 'Administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion,' which would be, as is obvious, quite an inappropriate title, had the framers of this service regarded it as a sacrifice. True, indeed, that in one of the prayers that follow the communion, the service is called a 'sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving,' and our souls and bodies are presented 'to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice;' but, no where, as far as I have been able to discover, is the word sacrifice clearly connected with, or referred to, the Eucharist. I speak of the *English Common Prayer* book; be-

cause in the American book of Common Prayer, along with many other changes, there is a long prayer, ('The oblation') introduced immediately after the words of consecration, in which bread and wine are called "holy gifts," and the prayer above referred to as *following* the communion is made to precede it, and is incorporated with it. This appears to have been done to supply the defect of any allusion to sacrifice; but the English Prayer Book is still without any word indicating the sacrificial character of the Eucharist. Indeed, there is no necessity of going into further proofs on this subject, since the Oxford tract writers admit that in the second book of Edward VI., of which I now speak, and which, without any alterations on this subject, has been in use in England ever since,—“the *whole* doctrine of the Eucharist was altered.” \*

The articles, prayer book and catechism—so far at least as they are intelligible,—may be taken as the exposition of the sentiments entertained by those who framed them; and these sentiments were evidently unfavorable to acknowledging a power of offering sacrifice as essential to the priestly character. The word 'altar' was disused, and disappeared entirely from the Liturgy in the second book of Common Prayer, where, even now, it is not to be found. The Scriptures themselves were shamelessly perverted, to remove every thing like a sanction of the idea of a Christian sacrifice. Thus, to give but two instances; St. Paul says, in the 1 Cor. ix. 13, (King James's version) “they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar;” and 1 Cor. x. 18—“are not they which eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar.”—In both these instances, the three Protestant Bibles, published in 1562, 1577, and 1579,

\* Oxford Tracts, p. 17.

put the word 'temple' instead of 'altar'; a manifest corruption, as the present authorized version sufficiently shows. On this instance of infidelity in the first Protestant translators, Ward says:—"To translate 'Temple' instead of 'altar,' is so gross a corruption, that had it not been done thrice immediately within two chapters, one would have thought it had been done through oversight, and not on purpose. The name of altar both in Hebrew and Greek, and by the custom of all people, both Jews and Pagans, implies and imports a sacrifice. We, therefore, with respect to the sacrifice of Christ's body and blood, say altar, rather than table; as all the ancient Fathers were accustomed to speak and write; though with respect to eating and drinking Christ's body and blood, it is called a table. But because Protestants will have a communion of bread and wine, or a supper, and no sacrifice; therefore, they call it table only, and abhor the word 'altar' as papistical; especially in the first translation of 1562, which was made when they were throwing down altars throughout England." \* Whitaker, a distinguished Protestant Divine, in the age of Elizabeth, expressly says:—"There are no priests now in the church of Christ." † And he explains himself further, a few pages afterwards:—"This name Priest is never in the New Testament peculiarly applied to the Ministers of the Gospel." ‡ And another divine of the Church of England, Pilkington, says:—"There are now no priests properly

\* Ward's Errata to the Protestant Bible, No. 77, 78. This very learned and most useful work has been reprinted by Cumiskey, Philadelphia. In it are found numerous other Protestant corruptions of the Sacred Text, made for the same object.

† Whitaker adversus Camp: p. 200.

‡ pa. 210.

so called ; because the Eucharist is not properly a sacrifice."

What was the doctrine of the Church of England on the subject of sacrifice, at the time when the form of ordination was changed, may be easily seen from a work to which few Episcopalians in this country will feel disposed to except. In the Lectures on the Catechism by Bishop White, we have in the 8th Dissertation, on the Eucharist, a section, with this title, "Of another error, held by some protestants." The writer proceeds, thus :—"The error referred to, is that the doctrine of the Eucharist involves the being therein a real or material sacrifice ; an altar ; and a priest, in the sense of an offerer of sacrifice." \* The bishop denies that the term 'sacrifice' is ever applied in the pages of the New Testament, to the commemorating of the death of Christ in the Eucharist.† He maintains the distinction between 'table' and 'altar ;' because, "an altar is a place of sacrifice ; and the taking of its name carries by implication, an assumption of its distinguishing property ;" ‡ but he admits that they may be used, one for the other, and just as every church may be said to be a house, so every altar may be said to be a table ; but as every house is not a church, so neither every table is not an altar.§—"What the primitive Church meant by Eucharistic oblation," says he, "may be seen in the Rubrics of the Episcopal Church, where she makes the 'offertory to *begin* with the collecting of the alms and other devotions of the people.' The sentiment is supposed to have come down to us from the earliest times, in which the oblation began with popular contributions ; and it was not perfected, until what had been thus gathered

\* p. 389. † 391. ‡ 392. § 392.

were presented at the Lord's table, in a solemn act of adoration. And this was done by the minister in the name of all." \*—"What she (the Episcopal Church) understands by 'oblation,' has been already shown by a reference to the rubrick before the reading of the sentences. And as to the term 'sacrifice, the only places in which it appears in any of her institutions, with a reference to the Eucharist, is in the prayer of consecration; where it is said—"We offer and present unto thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy and living sacrifice unto thee;" and again;—"Although we are unworthy, through our manifold sins, to offer unto thee any sacrifice, yet we beseech thee to accept this, our bounden duty and service.'

"Throughout the order for the Communion, the word 'table' is used always: the word 'altar,' never.

"In order to perceive the sense of the word 'priest,' in the institutions of the Church of England; it is proper to take into view her Latin book of common prayer; which is confessedly the document of paramount authority. This book uniformly makes use of the Latin word answering to a Christian minister,† and not that answering to an offerer of sacrifice.‡ This shows, that she considers the word 'priest,' as the original Greek word, accommodated with an English termination. And yet, the reformers had found the other Latin word transmitted to them in the religious services of their predecessors. But they perceived it to be a verbal intrusion, intimately allied to very dangerous error.

"Here then is decisive evidence, that the sentiments sustained in the present discussion were those of the

Church of England in the reign of Edward the Sixth : when the liturgy was reformed. That it so continued in the reign of Elizabeth, there needs no better evidence, than that of the sagacious Hooker ; who writes as follows — ‘ Seeing that sacrifice is now no part of the Church’s ministry ; how should the name of priesthood be thereunto rightly applied ? ’<sup>1</sup> This he states in the form of an objection on the part of his opponent. Hooker’s answer is — ‘ Surely, even as St. Paul applieth the name of flesh unto that very substance of fishes, which hath a proportionable correspondence to flesh, although it be in nature another thing : whereupon, when philosophers will speak warily, they make a difference between flesh in one sort of living creatures, and that other substance in the rest, which hath but a kind of analogy to flesh : the apostle contrarywise, having matter of greater importance whereof to speak, nameth indifferently both flesh. The fathers of the Church, with like security of speech, call usually the ministry of the gospel a priesthood, in regard of that which the gospel hath proportionable to ancient sacrifices ; namely, the communion of the blessed body and blood of Christ, although it hath properly now no sacrifice. As for the people, when they hear the name, it draweth no more their minds to any cogitation of sacrifice, than the name of a senator or an alderman causeth them to think upon old age ; or to imagine, that every one so termed, must needs be ancient, because years were respected in the first nomination of both. Wherefore, to pass by name, let them use what dialect they will ; whether we call it a priesthood, a presbytership, or a ministry, it availeth not : although in truth, the word presbyter doth seem most fit,

and in propriety of speech more agreeable than priest, with the drift of the whole gospel of Jesus Christ.’

“When Mr. Hooker speaks of the fathers, it is here supposed, that he expresses himself generally: and without a view to the distinction between the earliest and those which followed. Further, it is supposed, that the preference given by him to the name of ‘Presbyter,’ was owing to its being more definite: the name of ‘priest’ being also applied to a character of another description. Still, the two names originate in a Greek word, never confounded with what denotes an offerer of sacrifice.

“It may be proper to add, that the institutions of the Church of England and of this Church are, on the present subject, precisely what they were, when Mr. Hooker wrote as above.”

Further on, White says:—“In the course of the discussion it has been acknowledged that the here supposed errors concerning ‘Sacrifice,’ ‘Altars,’ and ‘Priest,’ arose at an early period of the christian church.—In England the doctrine which has been argued against, was completely put down at the Reformation. If in later times, the notion has been entertained by some of the clergy of the Church of England, it has not crept into her public institutions.

“Archbishop Laud, and the ruling Churchmen of his day, have been accused of endeavours to restore the very system, against which this section is directed. Doubtless, the belief of the existence of such a design, contributed to the disorders of that period, and to the temporary downfall of the established Church: and the apprehension of danger was much countenanced by some practices attempted to be introduced, without any authority of the Rubricks, particularly bowing towards the altar.



“ But that the persons now contemplated did not carry their designs to an extent inconsistent with the principles here maintained, appears in the unequivocal fact, that in preparing a liturgy for the Church of Scotland, for ‘ Priest’ they put ‘ Presbyter,’ which accordingly is still found in the said liturgy. The above fact is stated by the learned Selden, in his treatise ‘ De Synod. Vet. Ebræorum.’\* Be it, as Selden intimates, that this was done to reconcile the Scotch to an unpopular measure. Still, the agents were not so indiscreet, as to forfeit all pretensions to consistency in their religious system. If there should be alleged the cotemporary zeal manifested, to change the position of the Communion ‘ Tables ; the reason assigned, was to prevent an irreverent use of them ; and the point pressed was, not to make altars, but to place the tables where the altars formerly stood.”—p. 402, 403.

Once more, I must beg the reader to remember that in all that I have said or quoted, concerning sacrifice, I have not proposed to prove that the Eucharist is a sacrifice ; I have merely wished to state, in the language of unexceptionable witnesses, what was the doctrine of the church of England on that subject, during the reign of Edward VI., when the Ordinal was changed to its present form ; that thereby the inquirer after truth may be enabled to see the drift of the charges then made, and see whether they materially affect the subject of the present investigation. Neither do I undertake to show that the ministers of the New Law, are properly called ‘ priests,’ or that the word ‘ altar’ is appropriately applied to that portion of the christian temple usually designated by that name. What I have endeavored to show, is, that the English Reformers,

\* Vol. iii. lib. i. p. 408.

in the reign of Edward VI., denied the existence of the Eucharist as a sacrifice, and consequently denied that there were such things as priests and altars. This appears to me incontrovertibly proved by the single circumstance of their alteration of the Sacred Text, and by their omission of all mention of sacrifice in the Communion service, and articles of Religion. Hence, it is easy to account for the omission of all mention of the power to offer sacrifice, or of the priestly character, in the form devised by King Edward, for the ordination of priests. This form although already given, I here again insert.

“Receive the Holy Ghost, whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the word of God, and of his holy sacraments. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.”

Now there is nothing here that a deacon may not do; as the remission of sin, of which the Ordinal speaks, does not, according to the Protestant interpretation, necessarily include the idea of priestly absolution. This form is, then, insufficient; as it does not express the nature of the power conferred; and this, as has been already established, is an essential defect.

Let it be carefully remembered, that the insufficiency of this form was declared by the Catholic bishops in Queen Mary's time; that the Anglicans were constantly reproached with this obvious defect; and that, after it had been used for upwards of a century, it was altered, in a manner apparently calculated to meet the difficulty, by the addition of the words: “Receive the Holy Ghost **FOR THE OFFICE AND WORK OF A PRIEST**, in the Church of God, now committed to thee by the imposition of our hands, etc.” Will any man have courage to say, that this addition was not

made in consequence of the defects so constantly pointed out by Catholic divines?—or that, a change in the form, after such a lapse of time, could remedy the defect of invalid ordination, under which the English clergy, we may say, by their own showing, up to that time laboured?—“The man that wants hands to work with,” says Ward, “is not the much better for having tools.”

If Edward’s form for ordaining priests is invalid, as it most certainly is, it need scarcely be said that the order of bishop, even supposing that the form of episcopal consecration was faultless, cannot be conferred on those who have been ordained according to it. The episcopacy is but the plenitude of the priesthood; and, according to the general sentiment of Divines, cannot be conferred except on such as are previously priests.\* But besides this radical defect in the Anglican episcopal consecration, the form of ordaining a bishop, “devised” by King Edward, is, in itself, defective. It differs in no essential thing from that of priests; and this is but what we would naturally expect from the well known levelling sentiments of those who framed it.

This form, as used previous to 1662, is as follows:—

“Take thou the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up the grace of God, which is in thee by the imposition of hands; for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and soberness.”

Is there any thing in this to signify the office and character of a bishop? Might not the same formula be made use of, as Dr. Milner has well remarked, in laying

\* *Impossibile est ordinari episcopum, qui antea non sit presbyter, vel certe non tunc accipiat utramque ordinationem; quia utraque est essentia episcopatus.* Bellarmine, Lib. De Sacram. Ord. c. 5.

hands on children? Hence, the form of consecrating a bishop, "devised" by King Edward VI., is certainly insufficient; because, it contains nothing indicative and distinctive of the character of a bishop. This defect was objected, long and repeatedly, by the Catholics; and lo! in the year 1662, the house of Convocation endeavoured to remove the difficulty, by inserting in the ancient form, the words which I have marked in italics:

"Receive the Holy Ghost, *for the office and work of a bishop in the Church of God, committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands; in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,* and remember that thou stir up," etc.

Will any one have the courage to deny that this addition was not meant and intended, as it is apparently calculated, to supply the defect, so strongly urged by Catholic theologians; and that it, therefore, must be regarded as tantamount to an acknowledgement of the insufficiency of the form, which had been used during the first century of the English Church?

It is curious to observe the embarrassment of the defenders of Anglican orders in reconciling this proceeding of the Convocation with the sufficiency of Edward's form. The cause of the change, says Williams, was not to meet the objections of the Catholics, but to silence the complaints of some "ignorant presbyterians who took occasion to comfort themselves with the validity of their own ordinations, because that in our" (Anglican) "ordinals they did not find any positive distinction made between a bishop and a priest."\* The authority of Bishop Burnet is

\* The Succession of Protestant Bishops Asserted. C. iii.

adduced by this writer in support of this position. The bishop says :

“There was then, (that is, in king Edward’s times, &c.,) no express mention made in the words of ordaining them, that it was for the one or the other : in both it was said, ‘Receive the Holy Ghost. In the name of the Father,’ &c. But that having been since made use of, to prove both functions the same, it was of late years altered, as it is now. Nor were these words, being the same in giving both orders, any ground to infer that the Church esteemed them one order, the rest of the office showing the contrary very plainly.”

Supposing, now, that such was the immediate cause of the change,—a thing, however, I by no means admit,—does it not follow from the fact, that the form of episcopal consecration was, at least, defective, as it did not express any thing more than that of priestly ordination? The argument taken from the rest of the office will be hereafter answered.

In reply to these arguments, it is said, that, with regard to the form of consecrating priests, although the word “priest” be not found in Edward’s form, it occurs no less than four times in the ordination ceremony ; that this must be taken, as *one* act, and that the meaning of the form is to be determined by all that precedes and follows it, and by the general and avowed tendency of the whole ceremony. But this does not appear to be a safe principle, or, indeed, one that can be admitted. It would follow from it, that the wording of the form is a matter of perfect indifference ; or, at least, that in such circumstances as those supposed, it is not necessary that it should signify the spiritual effect it is intended to produce. This, cer-

tainly, cannot be admitted ; as is evident from the fact, that if an insufficient form of baptism were employed in the administration of that sacrament, it would be of no avail ; although it might have been frequently intimated in the preceding and subsequent part of the ceremony, that the child, or other person, was presented for baptism.

It is pretended that if the Eucharist be a sacrifice, as many of the most learned Protestants maintain “ that the words used in the Anglican form, empowering the candidate to minister the holy sacraments, are sufficient to confer that of offering sacrifice.” This I deny ; because, there is nothing in the public acts, or liturgy of the English Church, to show that the Eucharist is regarded as a sacrifice ; whereas, on the contrary, the changes made seem purposely to have been “ devised,” in order to exclude such an idea ; and secondly, because, whether the Anglican Church regards the Eucharist as a sacrifice or not, there is not the slightest trace of such a power being conferred in the aforesaid form of ordination.

It is a settled principle with Catholics that no error about the nature or efficacy of a Sacrament, no positive disbelief of its divine institution, or any other personal unworthiness on the part of him who administers it, can deprive such a sacrament of its effect,—provided sufficient matter, valid form, and the due intention, concur in its administration. But if the matter be omitted or curtailed of any essential part,—if the form be vitiated, or if ambiguity be introduced, for the purpose of introducing error, it is no longer a valid means of producing sacramental effects. Now, it is beyond all controversy, that the form of priestly ordination was changed under Edward, and couched in the vague manner above explained, for the purpose of introducing the error that the Eucharist is no sacrifice,—that presbyters were

not priests—sacerdotes—in the proper signification of the term,—and that the doctrines which had for so many ages prevailed in the English Church, on these subjects, were blasphemous fables.\* It is equally undeniable that the ancient form of episcopal consecration was set aside, and a new one of the most vague character introduced, for the purpose of bringing down the episcopal body to a level with the second order of the clergy ;—a purpose, which, according to Burnet's own showing, it answered so well, that it was, on this account, amended in 1662. Cranmer was the chief person engaged in changing the form ; and in the evidence of his presbyterian propensities, given in Chapter II, we have the best means of removing any ambiguity that might be about the form, if indeed any doubt existed regarding the meaning. It is distressing to see the dishonest artifice, by which Courayer endeavored to evade the difficulty arising from the well known sentiments of those who framed the present form. To prove that Cranmer and Barlow, whom he supposes to be the bishop of St. David's, did not succeed in their efforts to make the form as presbyterian as they would have wished, he says that they were opposed, and their judgments overruled by their brother bishops ; and in proof of this, he brings forward the sentiments of several of those bishops, who, he supposes, were concerned in the composition of the Ritual. He is careful, however, not to tell his readers, that the bishops in question had expressed these sentiments in the convocation, held in 1536, whereas the ordinal was composed in 1549 ! It is true he refers the reader to the second

\* This is the expression applied to the Roman Catholic doctrine of the Mass, in the 30th of Queen Elizabeth's thirty-nine articles of Religion.

volume of Burnet for the composition of the new ordinal (1519); and to the appendix to the first volume for the opinions expressed by the bishops in convocation (1536): but no one, not distrustful of Courayer's honesty, would suppose that the opinions he cites were not expressed in 1549, on occasion of the change, and not in 1536, when there was no question of any alteration.\*

'The ancient ordinals are appealed to, as a proof "that imposition of hands, and a prayer suitable to the order conferred is undoubtedly all that is essentially requisite in ordination."'† Supposing all this, does not our objection to the form consist in a denial that it is 'suitable to the order conferred'? The ancient ordinals prove nothing; unless they can be proved to have contained forms as vague and as insufficient, as those devised by Edward VI. Such forms, however, are only to be found in *one* liturgy—the book of Common Prayer.

Mr. Williams, in his attempted answer to Ward, dwells much on some ceremonies of the Catholic ordination, as if Catholics considered them to be essential to the rite; but without attaching importance to any thing else than what he himself has laid down, as 'essentially requisite in ordination',—imposition of hands, and a prayer suitable to the order conferred, Catholics can show that the Anglican form, devised by Edward, is insufficient; and were it necessary, can prove that their own forms contain all that is required. This however, not being denied by the Anglicans, and a vindication of our form not being necessary for the object of the present investigation, need not now be done.

The principal argument adduced by Williams, in sup-

\* See Courayer, 149.

† Williams, Chapter 11.



port of the form of Edward VI., is its substantial identity with the form which, according to him, is prescribed in the Roman Pontifical. Were this, indeed the case, all objections to the ordinations of the Anglican Church, grounded on the insufficiency of the form of Edward VI., must terminate. But the fact is not as he has stated; for although some theologians formerly regarded the words ‘Receive the Holy Ghost’, as, at least, part of the form, this opinion cannot be admitted, without an entire disregard of most certain facts and principles.

To sustain this objection, Williams adduces what he calls

“*The Romish form*” (*for priests*).

“Receive the Holy Ghost: whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained.”

And, in order to prove that this form is acknowledged by the Roman Church, he refers to the Council of Trent, Sess. 23. Can. IV., in which it is said: “If any body shall assert, that in holy orders, the Holy Ghost is not given, and consequently that the bishops say in vain: ‘Receive the Holy Ghost;’ let him be anathematized.”—The authority of Cardinal Bellarmine is also adduced, who is said to maintain, that the grace of the Holy Ghost is given to the candidate for priesthood, when it is said to him: “Receive the Holy Ghost.”

In answer to this objection, it may be replied, that the Council did not define, or in any way declare, that the form of conferring the Holy Ghost was these words: “Receive,” &c., but only that the Holy Ghost is imparted in ordination,—and, consequently, that the words, “Receive the Holy Ghost,” were verified; without, however,

saving,—much less defining,—that the Holy Ghost was given by them. This the council could not have possibly said; for it is certain, “that the imperative form, used by our Saviour: ‘Take the Holy Ghost,’ etc., was not observed for many ages in the Church.”

In the passage referred to by Williams, Bellarmine is occupied in proving that the imposition of hands is essential to ordination; he treats only incidentally of the form; and although he seems to regard the words “Receive the Holy Ghost,” as *part* of the form, he does not regard it as the *whole* form;—the words, “Receive the power of offering sacrifice, as well for the living as for the dead,” being, according to him, no less essential to ordination than the words, “Receive the Holy Ghost.”\* Whatever may be thought of this opinion of Bellarmine, it is certainly unfavourable to the form devised by Edward VI., in which there is no mention of offering sacrifice; and it is obviously unfair to quote his authority, without giving his entire opinion.

In order not to involve the general reader in a theological investigation, it is sufficient to state,—what is even admitted by Courayer and Williams,—that the supposed form “Receive the Holy Ghost,” “was not observed for many ages in the primitive Church.”† As this is a point which, of itself, destroys the identity sought to be established between the form of Edward VI., and those prescribed in the Roman Pontifical, I shall quote from an unexceptionable writer, the authorities by which it is sustained. “These words,” says Chardon, “which are found in the Roman Pontifical, Accipe Spiritum Sanctum,

\* Bellarmine, De Sacr. Ordinis. Lib. 1. C. IX.

Succession of Protestant Bishops Asserted. Chapter II.

etc. (Receive the Holy Ghost, etc.), in which many scholastics imagined they found the form of ordination, are not ancient; for even the earliest scholastics, such as Hugh of St. Victor, Alexander Hales, William of Auxerre, St. Bonaventura, and St. Thomas, make no mention of them, although they treat minutely of the rites of ordination.—Neither is it found in Latin Rituals of more than four hundred years antiquity, nor even in many modern rituals, as Father Morinus remarks. The Greeks and Syrians, to this day, have no such form. Many scholastics, however, believed them to be essential; because they imagined that the forms of the sacraments ought to be imperative. But now-a-days this opinion no longer prevails, no more than other sentiments of the schools regarding the sacraments. There are few among intelligent theologians who do not teach that the matter and form of ordination consists in the imposition of the bishop's hands and in the invocation of the Holy Ghost, although all agree with the Council of Trent, that the bishop who ordains, does not in vain say:—*Accipe Spiritum Sanctum, etc.*†

\* *Nulli rituales antiqui hæc habent verba, nusquam comparent; etiam in recentioribus multis nulla eorum mentio. Apud Latinos coepta sunt usurpari vix ab annis quadringentis, apud Græcos autem et Syros nec est, nec unquam fuit, illorum usus. Itaque nulla ratione dici possunt ad ordinis substantiam pertinere. Morinus, De Sacris Ordinationibus, pars. 3. exercit. 2. Cap. 2. p. 22.*

*Verba illa, Accipe Spiritum Sanctum, quæ ante prædictam præfationem, cum manus impositione, ab ipso consecratore proferuntur, in quibus formam episcopatus reponunt scholastici recentiores, toti antiquitati ignota fuerunt: adeo ut vix in ullo Pontificali annos quadringentos attingente reperiantur. Martene, De Antiquis Ecclesiæ ritibus, lib. I. cap. 8. Art. 10. p. 330.*

† Chardon, Histoire des Sacremens. Liv. I. De L'Ordre. c. 8.

In what, then, it may be asked, does the Catholic form consist? I might, in reply, say that this question is irrelevant; as from what has been said, it is evident that the supposed identity between the forms of Edward VI., and those in the Roman Pontifical, cannot be established; and, consequently, that the argument in support of the former, which is built on such a supposition, falls at once to the ground. I will, however, observe that as the Church has not defined what part of the ceremony of ordination is that called the form, theologians have enjoyed on this subject a speculative freedom of opinion, which does not at all interfere with their observance of the laws of the Church, by which they are bound to use the form at present prescribed in the Roman Pontifical. The Church not having defined the exact words that constitute the form of ordination, a certain latitude of opinions necessarily arose; and some theologians, arguing from the principle, that the form of ordination was not specifically determined by Christ, as were the forms of baptism and the eucharist, were easily led to consider these words, "Accipe," etc., as the form, although they may have been aware that they had not been always in use.

Having premised this for the benefit of those who are not theologians, I will state the opinion which appears to me to be best sustained by argument, namely, that the form of ordination consists in the prayer or prayers, by which the minister of the sacrament invokes grace on the candidate for orders, whereby he may be enabled to discharge his duties holily and with fruit.\* As it is not my object to defend this opinion, but merely to state it; and, thereby, show that the supposed similarity between the form of our

\* Tournelly, Tract. De Ordine, P. I. c. v.

Pontifical, and that of Edward VI., is any thing but certain; and, consequently, that the argument derived therefrom is inconclusive, I shall merely give, in a note, sufficient evidence that this opinion is maintained by great names in theology.\*

Bishop Bramhall says, that although there is nothing in the English form, no less than in ours (in which latter instance he evidently mistakes our form, as I have already shown), “ which doth distinctly and reciprocally express episcopal power and authority, yet that taken in connexion with the whole ceremony,—in which the candidate is seven times stated to be about to be consecrated bishop,—it fully expresses the nature of the episcopal office. This objection, like the similar one in regard to the form of priestly ordination, is answered by saying, that unless the form express the nature of the character it is intended to convey, it is insufficient, and invalidates the act. When

\* “Sententia quam tenent Martene, Becanus, Tournellius, Juvenin, Petrocorus, Concina, et alii cum S. Bonaventura, cui adhæret Benedictus XIV., vult utramque potestatem (nempe sacrificium offerendi et absolvendi) Sacerdoti conferri per secundam impositionem manuum, nempe cum Episcopus extendit manus super ordinandum unà cum Presbyteris assistantibus, sicut declaratur à Trid. sess. 14. c. 3, De Pœnit.—Quænam autem sit forma juxta hanc sententiam, alii dicunt esse verba :—*Accipe Potestatem*, etc. Sed forte probabilius dicunt Morinus et Tournellius esse orationem quam recitat Episcopus in præfata impositione ; et verba quæ recitat in fine in tertia manuum impositione, accipe ‘*Spiritum Sanctum*,’ esse *dicunt tantum declarativa Spiritus sancti jam accepti*. Hæc tertia sententia est probabilior”—Homo Apostolicus Sti Alphonso de Ligorio. Tract. XVII. De Extrema Unctione et Ordine. The same opinion is maintained by Selvagius Antiquitat. Christ. Inst. Lib. III. Cap. XIV. § 7. And by Van Espen, Juris Eccles. Univ. pars. I. Tit. XV. C. III. xiii. De consecratione Episcoporum.

a person is about to be baptized, all the preparatory prayers and ceremony sufficiently show that such is the object and end of the ceremony : but, as before said, if an insufficient form of baptism be employed, one that does not express the effect intended to be produced by the sacrament, no one will pretend that the sacrament is validly administered.

In the foregoing examination, I have omitted many grounds of exception to the Anglican form of ordination, which, were it necessary, might be urged with considerable effect. Abstracting from the question, whether it be competent for a national church to change the established forms of ordination, it is obviously not one of the prerogatives of the civil power. Now the change of the form of ordination made in the reign of Edward VI., and renewed by Elizabeth, was the act of the civil power in England ; and so far from being sanctioned by the English Church, was, especially in the latter case, effected in opposition to its solemnly declared sentiments. Whatever, then, be the value of Edward's form, it is deficient in its very source ; and cannot be regarded in any other light than as a violent and most unjustifiable interference with ecclesiastical authority.

## CHAPTER XII.

## Conclusion.

BEFORE taking leave of the reader who has accompanied me in the preceding investigation, it will be not without its advantage to take a rapid view of the ground we have passed over, and collect, as it were, into one point, the different conclusions I have endeavoured to establish in the preceding pages. I flatter myself, then, with having established the following conclusions.

I. That those ecclesiastics who were instrumental in carrying into effect the so-called Reformation in England, were persons who attached little or no importance to the rite of ordination, and who, in many of their acts, seem to have been influenced by the desire to abolish the ecclesiastical hierarchy, or, at least to strip it of the sacred character with which it had been before that time invested.

And here a difficulty may suggest itself to the reader's mind. If such were the sentiments of the first Anglican bishops, such the principles of the English reformers, how are we to account for the preservation of the hierarchy in England? This difficulty is easily solved. It is to Queen Elizabeth, and not to her bishops, that we must attribute this result. Every thing shows that the latter

were not generally inclined to recognize the divine institution of bishops : but the Queen, who had a strong inclination to the old faith, was anxious to conciliate her numerous Catholic subjects, and, if possible, frame a system, at least, externally similar to that which had been so long established in the kingdom. Hence, we are told by Heylin, that “the Queen had so resolved on the Episcopal government, that they (the partisans of Calvin) were not able to prevail in any respect.”\* This is so certain, that Courayer attributes to her the preservation of the hierarchy in England. His words are :—“Queen Elizabeth carried these views still further, *and this is what has preserved the hierarchy in England.*”† Indeed, the whole tenor of her conduct shows that she was not inclined to regard her title of “Supreme Governess” as an unmeaning appendage to her dignity. Before appointing bishops to the sees vacant by the deaths or deprivation of the Catholic prelates, she caused a general visitation of the whole kingdom to be made ; “by means whereof,” says Heylin, “the Church was settled and confirmed in so good an order, that the work was made more easy to the bishops when they came to govern than otherwise it could have been.”‡ The same candid historian gives her the merit of having preserved the Church in great splendour, and having thus afforded the bishops a pattern, which, in this respect, they should imitate. After mentioning a few instances, in which she spoke *ex cathedra* on points of doctrine, and corrected the Calvinistic tendency of some of the court-preachers, he says :—“The bishops and the clergy had been but ill pro-

\* History of the Reformation. Elizabeth, p. 132.

† Courayer, p. 252.

‡ Heylin, Reign of Eliz. p. 118.



ficients in the school of conformity under so excellent a mistress, if they had not kept the Church in the highest splendour, to which they were invited by that great example.”\* It must consequently appear no ways wonderful, that the episcopacy should be preserved, notwithstanding the presbyterian tendencies of those unprincipled churchmen, who were the pliant instruments of the Royal will, and whose temporal interests were so much promoted by the episcopal dignity and revenues.

II. That considerable difficulty was experienced in procuring the consecration of Parker, is acknowledged even by those who affirm the fact of his consecration at Lambeth; and, indeed, is placed beyond the possibility of doubt by the interval that elapsed between the commission of the 9th September, 1559, and the time of his supposed consecration, on the 17th of December of the same year,—by the “supplying” clause in the alleged commission of 6th December,—and by the opinion of the six counsel, given in p. 44.

III. The narrative of the Nag’s-head consecration has sufficient evidence to render it, at the very least, very probable; and those who testify their belief in its truth deserve not the abuse, which, in general, is the only reply made to the goodly array of evidence, which they marshal in support of their opinion.

IV. The Lambeth consecration is supported by documents of a very suspicious character; and although strongly affirmed by some grave historians, is liable to very serious difficulties, and, therefore, cannot be looked on as absolutely proved.

\* Heylin, *Reign of Eliz.* p. 124.

V. The consecration of Barlow cannot be positively *proved*, and, therefore, however certain it may be considered, cannot be otherwise regarded than as **HIGHLY PROBABLE**, even by those who undertake to maintain it; whereas, on the other hand, there are weighty reasons which render it still more **HIGHLY PROBABLE** that he never received episcopal consecration.

VI. The forms of ordination “devised” by Edward VI., were confessedly defective, and there is abundant reason to conclude that the defect invalidated the form; and whatever may be said of the present form, the use of the original form for upwards of one hundred years dispels every shadow of claim which the Anglicans might otherwise have to the possession of valid orders.

Let the reader remember that before the validity of the Anglican Ordinations can be established, it must be shown, Firstly, That Parker was **CERTAINLY** consecrated at Lambeth; Secondly, That Barlow had himself been **CERTAINLY** consecrated; and Thirdly, that the form used in Parker’s consecration was **CERTAINLY** valid: and, then, let him decide on the wisdom of those who build their hopes of salvation on a ministry which they regard as validly ordained, without being able to establish **ONE**, much less **ALL**, of the above facts.



## A P P E N D I X .

(A.)

THE following sketch of the Reformation in England, is from the preface to Dr. Heylin's History of the Reformation :

Reader !—I here present thee with a piece of as great variety, as can be easily comprehended in so narrow a compass ; the history of an affair of such weight and consequence, as had a powerful influence on the wealth of Christendom : it is an history of the reformation of the Church of England, from the first agitations in religion under Henry VIII., until the final settling and establishing of it (in doctrine, government, and worship,) under the fortunate and most glorious reign of Queen Elizabeth. Nor hast thou here a bare relation only of such passages, as those times afforded, but a discovery of those counsels, by which the action was conducted ; the rules of piety and prudence upon which it was carried ; the several steps by which it was promoted or retarded in the change of times ; together with the intercurrence of such civil concerns, both at home and abroad, as either were coincident with it, or related to it. So that we may affirm of this present history, as Florus doth of his compendium of the Roman Stories, *ut non tam populi unius, quam totius generis humani* ; that is to say, that it contains not only the affairs of one state or nation, but in a manner of the greatest part of all civil governments. The work first hinted by a prince

of an undaunted spirit, the master of as great a courage, as the world had any ; and to say truth, the work required it. He durst not else have grappled with that mighty adversary, who, claiming to be the successor of St. Peter in the see of Rome, and Vicar General to Christ over all the Church, had gained unto himself an absolute sovereignty over all Christian Kings and princes in the Western empire. But this King being violently hurried with the transport of some private affections, and finding that the Pope appeared the greatest obstacle to his desires, he first divested him by degrees of that supremacy, which had been challenged and enjoyed by his predecessors for some ages past, and finally, extinguished his authority in the realm of England, without noise or trouble ; to the great admiration and astonishment of the rest of the Christian world. 'This opened the first way to the reformation, and gave encouragement to those who inclined unto it ; to which the King afforded no small countenance, out of politic ends, by suffering them to have the Bible in the English tongue, and by enjoying the benefits of such Godly tractates (tracts) as openly discovered the corruption of the Church of Rome. But, for his own part, he adhered to his old religion, severely persecuted those who dissented from it, and died (though excommunicated) in that faith and doctrine which he had sucked in, as it were, with his mother's milk ; and of which he showed himself so stout a champion against Martin Luther, in his first quarrel with the Pope.

Next comes a minor (Edward VI.) on the stage, just, mild, and gracious ; whose name was made a property to serve turns withall, and his authority abused, (as commonly it happeneth on the like occasions) to his own undoing. In his first year, the reformation was resolved on,

but on different ends, endeavoured by some Godly bishops, and other learned and religious men of the lower clergy, out of judgment and conscience ; who managed the affair according to word of God, the practice of the primitive times, the general current and consent of the old Catholic doctors ; but not without an eye to such foreign Churches, as seemed to have most consonancy to the ancient forms ; promoted with like zeal and industry, but not with like integrity and Christian candour, by some great men about the court ; who under colour of removing such corruptions, as remained in the church, had cast their eyes upon the spoil of shrines and images (though still preserved in the greatest part of the Lutheran churches) and the improving of their own fortune by the Chantery lands. All which, most sacrilegiously they divided amongst themselves, without admitting the poor King to his share therein ; though nothing but the filling of his coffers, by the spoil of the one, and the increase of his revenues, by the fall of the other, was openly pretended in the conduct of it. But separating this obliquity from the main intendment, the work was vigorously carried on by the King, and his counsellors, as appears already by the doctrinals in the book of Homilies, and by the practical part of Christian piety, in the first public liturgy confirmed by act of Parliament, in the second and third year of this King, and in that act, (and, which is more, by Fox himself,) affirmed to have been done by the special aid of the Holy Ghost. And here the business might have rested if Calvin's pragmatistical spirit had not interposed. He first began to quarrel at some passages in this sacred liturgy ; and afterwards never left soliciting the Lord Protector, and practising by his agents on the court, the country and the universities, till he had laid the first foundation of the

Zuinglian faction, who laboured for nothing more than innovation both in doctrine and discipline, to which they were encouraged by nothing more than by some improvident indulgence granted unto John A Lasco ; who bringing with him a mixed multitude of Poles and Germans, obtained the privilege of a church for himself and his, distinct in government and forms of worship, from the church of England.

This gives a powerful animation to the Zuinglian gossellers (as they are called by Bishop Hooper, and some other writers,) to practise first upon the Church ; who being countenanced, not headed, by the Earl of Warwick, (who then began to undermine the Lord Protector) first quarrelled the episcopal habit, and afterwards inveighed against caps and surplices, against gowns and tippets ; but fell at last upon the altars, which were left standing in all the churches by the rules of the Liturgy. The touching on this string made excellent music to most of the grandees of the court, who had before cast many an envious eye on those costly hangings, that massy plate, and other rich and precious utensils, which adorned those altars. And what need all this waste ? said Judas ; when one poor chalice only, and, perhaps, not that, might have served the turn. Besides there was no small spoil to be made of copes, in which the priest officiated at the Holy Sacrament, some of them being made of cloth of tissue, of cloth of gold and silver, or embroidered velvet ; the meanest being made of silk, or satin, with some decent trimming. And might not these be handsomely converted into private uses, to serve as carpets for their tables, coverlids to their beds, or cushions to their chairs or windows. Hereupon some rude people are encouraged underhand to beat down some altars, which makes way for an order of the council table,

to take down the rest, and set up a table in their places ; followed by a commission to be executed in all parts of the kingdom, for seizing on the premises to the use of the King. But as the grandees of the court intended to defraud the King of so great a booty, and the commissioners to put a cheat upon the court-lords, who employed them in it : so they were both prevented in some places by the lords and gentry of the country, who thought the altarcloths, together with the copes and plate of their several churches, to be as necessary for themselves, as for any others. This change drew on the alteration of the former liturgy, reviewed by certain godly prelates, reduced almost into the same form in which it now stands, and confirmed by Parliament in the 5th and 6th years of this King, but almost as displeasing to the Zuinglian faction, as the former was. In which conjuncture of affairs died King Edward VI. From the beginning of whose reign the Church accounts the epoch of a reformation. All that was done in order to it under Henry VIII., seemed to be accidental only, and, by the by, rather designed on private ends, than out of any settled purpose to reform the church, and therefore intermitted and refused again, as those ends had variance. But now the work was carried on with a constant hand, the prelates of the church co-operating with the King and his council, and each contriving with the other for the honour of it. Scarce had they brought it to this pass, when King Edward died, whose death I cannot reckon on for an infelicity to the Church of England : for being ill-principled in himself, and easily inclined to embrace such counsels as were offered to him ; it is not to be thought, but that the rest of the bishoprics (before sufficiently impoverished) must have followed Durham, and the poor church he left as destitute of lands and orna-



ments, as when she came into the world in her natural nakedness. Nor was it like to happen otherwise in the following reign, if it had lasted longer than a nine days' wonder. For Dudley of Northumberland, who then ruled the roast, and had before dissolved, and, in hope, devoured, the wealthy bishopric of Durham, might easily have possessed himself of the greatest part of the revenues of York and Carlisle. By means whereof, he would have made himself more absolute on the north side of the Trent, than the poor titular queen (a most virtuous lady), could have been suffered to continue on the south side of it. To carry on whose interests and maintain her title, the poor remains of the Church's patrimony was, in all probability, to have been shared among those of that party, to make them sure unto the side. But the wisdom of this great Achithophel being turned to foolishness, he fell into the hands of the public hangman, and thereby saved himself the labour of becoming his own executioner.

Now Mary comes to cut her part, and she drives on furiously. Her personal interests had strongly biassed her to the Church of Rome; on which depended the validity of her mother's marriage, and consequently her own legitimation and succession to the crown of this realm. And it was no hard matter in a time unsettled, to repeal all the acts of her brother's reign, and after to restore the Pope unto that supremacy, of which her father had deprived him. A reign calamitous and unfortunate to herself and her subjects; unfortunate to herself in the loss of Calais; calamitous to her subjects, by many insurrections and executions; but more by the effusion of the blood of so many martyrs. For although she gave a check to the rapacity of the former times; yet the professors of the reformation paid dearly for it, whose blood she caused to be

flowed forth like water, in most parts of the kingdom; but no where more abundantly, than in Bonner's slaughter house; which being within the view of the court, and under her own nose (as the saying is) must needs entitle her to a great part of those horrid cruelties, which almost every day were acted by that bloody butcher.\* The schism at Frankfort took beginning in the same time also, occasioned by some zealots of the Zuinglian faction, who needs must lay aside the use of the public liturgy (retained by all the rest of the English exiles) the better to make way for such forms of worship, as seemed more consonant to Calvin's platform, and the rules of Geneva. Which woful schism, so wretchedly begun in a foreign nation, they laboured to promote by all sinister practices in the Church of England, when they returned from exile in the following reign. The miserable effects whereof we feel too sensibly and smartly, to this very day.

\* Without wishing to do more than what I consider an act of justice to Queen Mary, I must caution the reader against receiving this description of Heylin, as a just picture of the reign of this calumniated Queen. The editor of Collier's Ecclesiastical History, lately published in London, in a long note, found at the end of this Queen's reign, gives, with a spirit of justice deserving of all praise, a very satisfactory extract from Dodd's History, now being republished by the Rev. Mr. Tierney, by which it appears evident that during the early part of Mary's reign, the reformers were not punished by the civil power, and that it was not until they had acted in the most unjustifiable and seditious manner, they were made to feel the severity of the then existing laws for the punishment of heresy. See also "Letters to a Prebendary," by Right Rev. Dr. Milner, Letter 10, "Persecution," in which it is demonstrated that if Mary was a persecutor, it was not in consequence of her religion she became such.

But the great business of this reign related to the restitution of the Abbey lands, endeavoured earnestly by the Queen, and no less strenuously opposed by the then present owners, who had all the reason in the world to maintain that right, which by the known laws of the land, had been vested in them.———\*

And so Queen Mary makes her exit, and leaves the stage to Queen Elizabeth her younger sister; a princess, which had long been trained up in the school of experience, and knew the temper of the people whom she was to govern, who having generally embraced the Reformed religion, in the time of her brother, most passionately desired the enjoyment of it under her protection. And she accordingly resolved to satisfy the piety of their desire, as soon as she had power and opportunity to go through with it. In prosecution of which work she raised the whole fabric on the same foundation, which had been laid by the reformers in the reign of King Edward; that is to say, the word of God, the practice of the primitive times, the general current of the Fathers, and the example of such churches, as seemed to retain most in them of the ancient forms. But then she added thereunto such an equal mixture both of strength and beauty, as gave great lustre to the Church, and drew along with it many rare felicities on the civil state, both extraordinary in themselves and of long continuance, as the most Excellent King James hath right

\* I have omitted the remaining part of this paragraph, as it is no wise connected with the history of the Reformation; and seems to have been introduced here for the purpose of showing that the same principles which justified the holders of Church property confiscated under Henry VIII. and Edward VI., did not apply to those who had purchased Church lands, during the time of the common wealth, under Cromwell in England.

Well observed : so that we may affirm of the reformation of the Church of England, as the Historian doth of the power and greatness of the realm of Macedon : that is to say, that the same arts by which the first foundation of it were laid by Philip, were practised in the consummation and accomplishment of it, by the care of Alexander. From the first year of her reign, the liturgy, being first reviewed, and qualified in some particulars, was confirmed by act of Parliament ; in her first year, the articles of religion were agreed upon in the convocation ; and in the eighth, the government of the Church by Archbishops and bishops, received as strong a confirmation as the laws could give it. And, for this last, we are beholden unto Bonner, the late Bishop of London, who being called upon to take the oath of supremacy, by Horn of Winton (Winchester,) refused to take the oath upon this account, because Horn's consecration was not good and valid, by the laws of the land. Which he insisted on, because the ordinal established in the reign of King Edward (by which both Horn and all the rest of Queen Elizabeth's bishops received consecration,) had been discharged by Queen Mary, and not restored by any act of Parliament in the present reign. Which being first declared by Parliament, in the eighth of this Queen, to be *casus omissus*, or rather, that the ordinal was looked upon as a part of the liturgy, which had been solemnly confirmed in the first of this Queen's reign, they next enacted and ordained, that "all such bishops, as were consecrated by that ordinal, in the times preecedent, or should be consecrated by it, in the time to come, should be reputed to be lawfully ordained and consecrated to all intents and purposes, in the law whatever." Which added as much strength to the episcopal government, as the authority of man, and an act of Parliament, could possibly confer

upon it. This made the Queen more constant in her former principles, of keeping up the Church in its power and purity, without subjecting it to any, but herself alone. She looked upon herself as the sole fountain of both jurisdictions, which she resolved to keep in their proper channels; neither permitting them to mingle waters upon any occasion, nor suffering either of them to invade and destroy the other. And to this rule she was so constant, that when one Morrice, being then Attorney of the dutchy of Lancaster, had offered a bill ready drawn to the House of Commons, in the thirty-fifth of her reign, for the retrenchment of the Ecclesiastical Courts, in much narrower bounds; she first commanded Coke, then speaker, not to admit of any such seditious bills for the time to come. And, that being done, she caused the person of the said Attorney to be seized upon, deprived him of his place in the dutchy-court, disabled him from practising as a common lawyer, and, finally, shut him in Tutbury Castle, where he continued till his death. By which severity, and keeping the like constant hand in the course of her government, she held so great a curb on the puritan faction, that neither her Parliaments, nor her courts of justice, were from thenceforth much troubled with them, in the rest of her reign.

'This is the sum, and method of the following History.

*(History of the Reformation of the Church of England, by Peter Heylin. London. 1661.)*

Among the 'godly prelates' who co-operated with the royal power, in bringing about the Reformation in England, Craumer, archbishop of Canterbury, was the most conspicuous, and had the greatest influence in effecting the change. A knowledge of the facts of his life will show most clearly that in all that he did, or caused other eccle-

Maſtics to do, he was nothing more than the baſe inſtrument of a tyrant's will, and was himſelf a man entirely deſtitute of religious principle. I take the following comprehensive ſketch of his character from a note in Dr. Milner's "Vindication of the End of Controverſy." Pa. 112. Philadelphia Edition:—

Archbiſhop Cranmer having been the principal author of the Articles, the Liturgy and the Reformation, as it is called, of the Church of England, and his memory being immoderately extolled on this account, it is proper to take the following facts into conſideration for forming a true judgment of him. He firſt roſe to notice, while a ſtudent at Cambridge, by declaring for the divorce of Queen Catharine, and ſuggeſting that, to promote this, the opinion of different Universities ſhould be procured on the point, *whether a marriage with a brother's widow is not contrary to the law of God?* This ſuggeſtion made his worldly fortune: Henry followed it up by ſending to different Universities his Envoys and his *Angels* (*pieces of money ſo called*) ſwearing at the ſame time, that "Cranmer had *got the right ſow by the ear.*" Going himſelf into Germany on the Divorce buſineſs, Cranmer there became a Lutheran, and took for his ſecond wife Oſiander's ſiſter, whom, however, being a Prieſt, and the law of celibacy ſtill exiſting in England, he could not bring into it but as a ſmuggled article, and therefore ſtowed her in a large box. In 1532 he was named by Henry to the ſee of Canterbury, and, at his conſecration ſaid Maſs, and ſwore obedience to the Pope, in direct oppoſition to his religious principles. In like manner, he ſigned Henry's Six Articles againſt Proteſtantiſm, obliging his clergy to do the ſame, and to vow celibacy, when any of them were ordained, though he never obſerved it, nor believed in the

Articles himself. He even published books in defence of Transubstantiation, and persecuted the Protestants who denied it, even to the extremity of death at the stake, during the whole life-time of his Royal master. On the 14th of November, 1532, he assisted as a witness at the marriage of the King with Ann Boleyn; and on the 11th of the following March, he wrote a formal letter to the former, moved thereto, as he declared, "by pure motives of conscience," in which he represented the necessity there was of terminating the long pending cause between him and his Queen, and demanded of him the necessary *spiritual power* to pronounce upon it. Having obtained a commission to this effect, on the 20th of May, he issued a sentence of divorce between the King and the Queen, authorizing the King to marry again, six months after he had witnessed his marriage with Ann Boleyn, and not four months before the latter was delivered of an infant, who became the famous Queen Elizabeth! The tyrant, growing jealous or weary of his bride, Cranmer acted the infamous part of extorting from her a confession of what he had before proved to be false, namely, that she had never been validly married to Henry, on account of a pre-contract, and this, at the very time, when she was lying under sentence of death for *adultery*, in his regard!—Burnet, Collier, &c. The King's fourth wife was Ann of Cleves, concerning whom, as there was some question of her being under a pre-contract, Cranmer was formally commissioned to inquire into it, when he formally pronounced that no such contract existed. However, as the King, within six months, became disgusted with this his foreign wife, Cranmer was again commissioned to examine the business, when, in compliance with the tyrant's will, he decided that the contract was valid, and that the King was free to

## APPENDIX.

take a fifth wife ! On the death of Henry, he concurred as an executor, in setting aside the greater part of his will, and became as abject a tool to the ambition and avarice of Somerset, as he had been to the lust of Henry. To gratify these, he subscribed the death warrant of his brother, Thomas Seymour, the Lord Admiral, who was a mere victim of political intrigue, though he, Cranmer, was exempt, by his ecclesiastical character, from the necessity of concurring in such a sanguinary sentence ; and with equal pliancy, when Dudley, Earl of Warwick, gained the mastery, he set his hand to the warrant that consigned Somerset himself to the block ! He even took a principal part in the treason of abrogating the eventual right of King Henry's children, Mary and Elizabeth, to the Crown, and transferring it to Dudley's son and daughter-in-law, Lady Jane. As he had, in Henry's reign, brought John Lambert, Ann Askew, John Frith, William Allen, and other Protestants to the stake for denying the Real Presence of Christ in the Sacrament, so he manifested the same intolerance with regard to other Protestants whose ideas of the Reformation went further than his own, during the reign of Edward. He even constrained the Royal child Edward, in spite of his tears and expostulations, to sign the death warrant of Jane Knell, a harmless visionary, and George Van Par, an Anabaptist, who were burnt at the stake. Early in this reign, he had himself sung a High Mass of Requiem for the soul of the deceased French King, than which nothing could be more contrary to his professed doctrine ; and even, after the death of Edward, he offered to do the same for the soul of the latter, to please Queen Mary, which was a complete revocation of his Forty-two Articles and Second Liturgy. Being brought to his trial for treason and heresy he signed



six different forms of recanting the whole Protestant Religion, each stronger than the preceding one, at the same number of times, during the last two months of his life, and thus was, until with an hour of his death, either a sincere Catholic, or an egregious hypocrite ! Strype's *Mem. Eccl.* Vol. iii. p. 234. For a sketch of Cranmer's fellow labourers, Hooper, Latimer, and Ridley, see "Letters to a Prebendary," p. 136.

## (B)

Father Courayer, whose name occurs so frequently in the preceding pages, is regarded by all as the best advocate of the English ordinations. The extraordinary, and to some, perhaps, startling, fact, that a Catholic priest should be found impugning the practice of his own Church, on the question of re-ordaining converts from the Anglican clergy ; and maintaining the validity of Anglican orders, against the prevailing opinion of Catholic theologians, seems to require a sketch of his character as almost necessary to explain what, at first sight, must appear a very inexplicable phenomenon. The following notice of his interference in the ordination controversy, and of some circumstances of his subsequent career, are from the pen of Mr. Charles Butler, whom no one acquainted with his writings will accuse of being unjust towards the enemies of the Church.

## DOCTOR COURAYER.

Soon after the reformation was established in England by Queen Elizabeth, a controversy arose on the validity of the ordinations of the clergy of the church of England. Dodd gives, in his *Church History*,\* a full view of the

\* Vol. 11. p. 269. et seq.

principal facts and arguments produced by the writers on each side. The controversy was renewed by Mr. Thomas Ward in 1719 : a work,\* written by him on the subject, was much read, and produced several answers. Some publications on the same subject,—as the “*Memoires sur la validité des ordinations des Anglois*,” of the abbé Renaudot—appeared on the continent. They attracted the attention of Peter Francis Courayer, a canon regular of St. Génévieve at Paris. In the disputes on jansenism he had taken an active part, and was among those who appealed from the Bull *Unigenitus*. In 1723, he published his “*Dissertation sur la validité des Ordinations des Anglois, et sur la succession des Evêques de l'Eglise Anglicane*,”—which was immediately translated into English. Replies to it were published by the abbé Gervaise, Mr. Fennel, and the fathers Hardouin and le Quien of the Society of Jesus : † that of father le Quien was considered to be most ably written. Father Courayer published a defence of his work in 1726. The university of Oxford presented him with a diploma, conferring upon him the degree of doctor of laws.

Understanding that his liberty was in danger, he took refuge in England, and was kindly received by Dr. Wake, then archbishop of Canterbury, and by Dr. Sherlock, bishop of London : a pension was settled on him. His work was censured in France, first by the Cardinal de Noailles, then by two different assemblies of bishops, one at Paris, another at Embrun, and finally by a bull of Pope Benedict

\* “The Controversy of ordination truly stated.”

† Here Mr. Butler is mistaken. Father le Quien was a Dominican, not a Jesuit.

the fourteenth. As a reply to these he published his "*Relation historique et apologetique des sentimens et de la conduite du Pere le Courayer, chanoine regulier de Ste. Génévieve.*"—He afterwards published French translations with notes of "Father Paul's History of the Council of Trent," and Sleidan's "History of the Reformation." He died in 1776, at the advanced age of ninety-five, retaining to the last his mental faculties. He was well received at the court of George the second, and particularly noticed by Queen Caroline and the Princess Amelia. Having lived in intimacy with many persons of distinction both in France and England, and being possessed of extensive literary information, his conversation was singularly pleasing and instructive. He always professed himself to be a sincere member of the Roman Catholic religion, and attended mass regularly on Sundays and Holydays, when his health permitted, and an opportunity of doing it, offered; but, when this was not the case, he attended the service of the parish church.

After the decease of Courayer, Dr. Bell, prebendary of Westminster, published his last sentiments, under the title of "*Declaration de mes derniers sentimens sur les différens dogmes de la Religion, par feu Pierre Francois le Courayer.*" The manuscript of it had been given by him to the princess Amelia, about nine years before his death. He professes in it to die a member of the Roman Catholic Church; but the contents of it make it evident that he could not be accounted a member of that, or any other established church. In 1814, a more full exposition of his religious sentiments, intituled, "*Traité où l'on expose ce que l'Ecriture nous apprend, de la Divinité de Jesus Christ,*" was published by Dr. Bell. From these works

the general laxity of père Courayer on religious subjects, clearly appears.”—(*Historical memoirs of the English Catholics*. Vol. 3. pa. 187—190.)

## C.

THOMAS NEALE was born at Yeate in Gloucestershire, entered when a child into the college near Winchester, by the endeavours of his mother's brother, Alexander Belsire, Fellow of New College, where profiting exceedingly in Grammar learning in the school there, was chosen probationer of New College in 1538, and two years after was admitted true and perpetual Fellow of the same house. Afterwards prosecuting his studies with great industry, took the degree of Master of Arts; in 1546, holy orders, and soon after became an able theologist, and admirably well skilled in the Greek and Hebrew languages; the last of which he read to several young scholars in the University, particularly to Bernard Gilpin of Queen's College.—About that time Sir Thomas Whyte, who was afterwards founder of St. John's College, having had notice of his pregnant parts and virtues, did for an encouragement allow him a yearly pension of £10. In the beginning of Queen Mary, he became chaplain to Dr. Bonner, bishop of London, and in 1556 being newly returned from Paris, and other places in France, he was admitted to the reading of the sentences, being then Rector of Thenforth in Northamptonshire. But when Q. Elizabeth came to the crown, and thereupon bereft of his Lord and patron, Bonner, he betook himself to Oxon (Oxford), and in 1559, he was made the Queen's professor, of the Hebrew lecture, entered himself a commoner of Hart-hall, and built little

lodgings opposite thereunto, joining to the west end of New College Cloister, wherein he lived several years: but his religion being more catholic than protestant, he left Oxon as he had done his lecture before, and being of a timorous nature, and always dreading his being called into question for his seldom frequenting the church and receiving the Sacrament, he retired to an obscure village called Cassington,—where purchasing a house, he spent the remainder of his days in study and devotion. As he was accounted by many an eminent theologian and linguist, so by some a tolerable philosopher, poet, and geographer,

(Here follows an account of his writings.)

What else he hath performed either in writing or translating, I cannot tell, neither any thing material of him besides only, (1) that he is noted by some writers, to be the original reporter of the consecration of Mathew Parker to the see of Canterbury, at the Nag's head Tavern in Cheapside, which since is manifestly made a mere forgery, and (2) that in the year 1590 he being then 71 years of age, did put up a monument for himself.—*Wood's Athenæ Oxonienses*, Vol. 1. p. 249, London, 1721.

(D.)

TO THE REV. THOS. FLRINGTON, D. D.

*Late Senior Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin.*

REV. SIR,

UNTIL the present day, I had been for some time past resolved, and indeed prepared to send you a detailed answer to your late work, entitled: "The Clergy of the Church of England truly ordained, and not obliged to subscribe to damnable contradictions, in answer to Ward's Controversy of Ordination," the rough draft of which reply is now lying before me; and though, Sir, I am sensible of the advantage I hereby give you, in the possible event of a serious debate between us on the subject in question, I am resolved to lay before you an outline of the answer which I intended to make to you.

I begin my treatise, Sir, with stating my motive for replying to you; namely, your implied attack upon me; for you expressly say: "I wish to be understood, whenever I name Mr. Ward, to mean the person who has adopted and published his book, and, by so doing, made himself responsible for it, as if he had really been the author of it, and had written it at the present time." \* Now, as it is publicly known that I have constantly been charged with being the publisher of that book, and as this charge has been brought against no one else but me, it is plain that your very severe blows are aimed at me. I then demonstrate the egregious mistake you are under in this

\* Note p. 7.

particular, as also in supposing my episcopal brethren to have been encouragers of the obnoxious work. In a word, Sir, I prove you to be a literary Quixotte, who fancy yourself combating with a host of gigantic foes, whilst you are only tilting at the puny speculation of a bookseller!

In the next place, I disclaim the attempt of diving into all this long and intricate controversy, because, on one hand, it is of a nature so peculiarly irritating to the Clergy of the Established Church, and because, on the other, it is of no sort of consequence to the defence or truth of my own Church; on the contrary, I profess to content myself with barely refuting the arguments of Dr. Erlington, and with showing that he, like Dr. Ryan, injures the cause which he undertakes to support.—I begin by proving that he injures it at his very outset; since of the four alledged Catholic authors whom he appeals to as favorable to his cause,<sup>+</sup> two of them were excommunicated for their errors, the third was only saved from this censure on the same account, through the interference of a great King, and the fourth, Bossuet, speaks of the orders of the Church of England in such opprobrious terms, that I should feel greater repugnance in publishing his words, than all the rest of my treatise put together.

I then demonstrate that Dr. Elrington does still greater injustice to his cause, by the too extended ground upon which he places it; and here I show my candor to him, as I did before to Dr. Ryan, by refusing to take advantage of an important concession which he improperly makes to me.—The first question, in order to decide upon the invalidity of the English Ordinations, is, whether Mathew Parker, the first Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury in

Queen Elizabeth's reign, was duly consecrated ! 'The Lambeth Register, (which Ward pretends is a forgery) mentions three Bishops (besides a suffragan) as assisting at his consecration, Barlow, Scory, and Coverdale. The next question, then, is, whether these men themselves had received episcopal consecration ? It answered Ward's purpose, in different respects, to depreciate these apostate friars \* as much as was in his power, and to deny that any one of the three had been consecrated. Nevertheless, layman as he was, he knew too much of theology, to assert that a defect in the orders of the *assistant Prelates*, Scory and Coverdale, would have invalidated the consecration of Parker, provided only the *consecrating Prelate*, Barlow, had himself been consecrated, † and that he used the proper form for that purpose. Accordingly, he speaks of Barlow as of a man " who had been imposed upon the nation for such a Bishop, that on him *must be built, as on a foundation*, the whole Episcopacy and Priesthood of the Church of England." ‡ Now Dr. Elrington, as I show, very unwarily, as well as very untheologically, admits, that " if Ward could prove that *Scory* and *Coverdale* (in addition to Bar-

\* Coverdale and Scory were apostate friars, and Barlow an apostate monk. They all three abjured their vows of chastity and religion to follow the liberty of the new gospel. But the two latter abandoned it and returned to their ancient faith in Mary's time, which they again abjured under Elizabeth. Coverdale kept himself abroad during that time.

† It is true, the ancient as well as the modern canons prescribe that three Bishops should be present at a consecration. But this is barely a *precept*, not an *essential condition*. It appears by the form used in the Church of England, as well as in the Catholic Church, that only one Prelate is considered as the consecrator.

‡ P. 15.



low) were *not truly Bishops*, it would then follow that *Parker also was not a Bishop*, and the succession of the English Clergy would be destroyed." \* It is here to be observed, that Ward has adduced some very strong documents, though not so many as he might have done, against the consecration of Scory and Coverdale, arguments which Dr. E. is far from having answered in a satisfactory way.

Having enlarged upon this capital blunder of Dr. Elrington, I proceed to the grand inquiry : whether Barlow, who is named as the consecrating Bishop of Mathew Parker is proved by Ward's antagonist to have himself received episcopal consecration. Ward argues, and it is admitted on all hands, that though special mention is made in the registers of Barlow's *appointment* to the See of St. David's in the year 1535, and of his *confirmation* in it by Archbishop Cranmer, there is no hint of the important circumstance of his *consecration*. Now this defect Dr. E. endeavors to supply by a number of presumptive proofs, which of course I am put upon examining. I show, then, that this gentleman is under an egregious mistake in supposing that Barlow's *ranking as a Bishop*, and being *admitted as such* to the bench of Bishops in Parliament and in synods, and his being translated to other sees, and even being present, as an *assisting prelate* at the consecration of other bishops, are any proofs of his having been *consecrated himself*. Arguing on this head from canon law and ecclesiastical history, I show that it is *episcopal confirmation* alone which gives the Prelate *authority to govern his diocese*, and which properly *makes him the Bishop of it*, together with every *right, privilege, and power* belonging to a Bishop except the power of confer-

ring orders and confirming children, even though he *never should be consecrated at all*: whereas if he were even consecrated for a diocese, without being confirmed for it, he would have no right, privilege, or power in it whatever. In this manner I repress the empty triumph of Dr. E. over poor Ward. In like manner I show that the act of parliament under Henry VIII., which the Doctor refers to, adds no weight to his opinion, as it was made to restrain the power of the Pope, not that of the King; that Barlow himself, so far from making any account of consecration, publicly preached (which he could have no reason for doing, unless to excuse his own want of consecration) “that if the King’s Grace, being Supreme Head of the Church, did denominate any lay man to be a Bishop, he would as good a Bishop as himself, or the best in England:” moreover, that his metropolitan Cranmer, whose business it was, according to the canons, to enforce Barlow’s consecration within three months from his appointment, taught and subscribed, in records which I refer to, the same anti-episcopal doctrine which Barlow preached, and that he and most of his time-serving brethren acted upon this principle, when they petitioned the child Edward VI. for a renewal of their episcopal powers, on the scandalous plea that they had terminated with the life of Henry VIII., which powers they were content to receive and hold like a civil office, “*Durante bene placito* ;” and “*Quamdiu se bene gesscrit.*”

Such being the prevailing low-church notions of the prelates themselves about Consecration and Apostolical Succession, in conformity with those of the foreign Protestants \* at the beginning of the reformation, it might

\* The Catholic Bishop of Naumberg being dead, Luther, a private monk, consecrated his own pot companion, Nicholas Amsdorf,

seem useless to take notice of the concessions of the early Protestant writers of this country, or the reproaches of their contemporary Catholic antagonists on the subject; nevertheless, as Dr. E. is so extremely warm, and even violent in his language against Ward concerning it, I go through both these chapters, and I show that, so far from disarming the latter, he puts new weapons into his hands, or the hands of those who choose to fight his battles.—In conclusion, being foiled in all his attempts to answer Ward's objections on the subject of Barlow's ordination, (the main hinge, as I observed, on which that of Parker turns) the Doctor has recourse to retorsion, and addressing himself to Ward's supposed publisher, that is to me, he indignantly asks me, whether I do not know that twelve other Bishops, whom he names, labour under the same disadvantage that Barlow does, in having no register of their consecration? \* This challenge, of course, puts

to succeed him. Sleidan, Comment. 1. 14. This Amsdorf taught that "good works, so far from being a help, were an impediment to salvation." Mosheim's Eccl. Hist. by MacLaine, vol. iv. p. 328.

\* One of these prelates was the mild and edifying Cardinal Pole, concerning whose register of consecration, as well as his conduct, I demonstrate that Dr. Elrington is guilty of the most inexcusable misrepresentation. Two instances of this, namely, that the Cardinal "made the See of Canterbury vacant by the murder of Cranmer," and that "he took possession of it on the first Sunday after that murder," p. 106. I refute by the arguments of the learned Anthony Harmer (Henry Wharton, Chaplain to Archbishop Sancroft) in his "Specimen of Errors in Burnet's History of the Reformation." This author shows that Cranmer was dead in the eye of the statute and canon law of England, and therefore no longer in possession of the archbishopric, upon his being attainted of high treason against Mary and Elizabeth, the two daughters of his benefactor Henry VIII. in favour of Jane Grey, two years and a half before his execution ;

me upon investigating the matter ; the result of which is a discovery, that of the twelve Bishops whom he sets down as unregistered, two of them never existed in the sees for which he names them ; and with respect to the remaining ten, I produce the consecration registers of them all except one, who, as I give reason to believe, was consecrated at Rome.

. But beside the question relative to Barlow's being a

and that soon after his condemnation he became equally dead in the eye of the Catholic canon law, in consequence of his being deposed and excommunicated by the Pope : so that his natural life was not the smallest obstacle to the advancement of the Cardinal, or of any other person to the archbishopric. Accordingly, the latter was chosen and confirmed archbishop, and put in full possession of all the spiritualities and temporalities belonging to the see long before Cranmer's death. Nevertheless, it so happened from different causes, that he could not be ordained priest, and of course could not be consecrated till about the time of Cranmer's death. If Ward or I had committed any such egregious blunders, though with no malicious intention, Dr. E. would have exclaimed in his usual style and with a note of admiration : *Proh Pudor !* How averse the Cardinal was from those horrid scenes of blood which disgraced the latter part of Mary's reign all historians testify. And how gladly he would have saved Cranmer's life, at the expense of all the honours and emoluments of the archbishopric, which he was then in possession of, is seen in his humane and edifying letter to that unhappy time-serving prelate, of which the following is an extract : "*Si te ab horribili illa, quæ tibi, nisi resipiscas, impendit (non solum corporis sed etiam animæ) mortis sententiâ, ullo modo liberare possem, id profecto omnibus divitiis atque honoribus, Deum testor, libentissime anteponerem.*" Inter Epist. Poli,——How different a disposition Cranmer himself evinced whilst he was in power, by the crowds of victims (and those mostly Protestants, and for being Protestants) whom he sent to the fire, I have shown in my Letters to a Prebendary. See Letter v. p. 175. 4th edit.

*consecrated* Bishop, there is another grand question,\* as you know, Sir, relating to the validity of the form which he must have made use of on the occasion in question ; or rather, of the forms in general which were universally used by the Established Church, as well in the ordination of Priests as in the consecration of Bishops, down to the year 1662, when these forms were altered. The subject is delicate, and therefore I shall touch it very slightly and briefly. What Ward maintains, arguing the point from reason and authority, is in substance this. In conferring the peculiar office and power annexed to each holy order, it is essential that a form should be used by the Prelate consecrating or ordaining, expressive of the peculiar office and power intended to be conferred : whereas he says, the form of consecrating Bishops,\* as it stands in the old Ritual, composed by Cranmer, is just as proper for the ceremony of confirming, or laying hands upon children,† as it is for conferring the powers of the Episcopacy. He likewise argues that the form of ordaining Priests is equally

\* The following is the ancient form devised by Cranmer. The Archbishop says to the prelate elect : " Take the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is in thee by the imposition of hands : for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and soberness."

† In cutting down the Catholic Missal, Breviary, Ritual, and Pontifical into the Book of Common Prayer, and that of making and consecrating Bishops, Priests, &c. as well as in framing the Articles, it is plain that Cranmer and his fellow labourers were divided between the fear of the objections of the Catholics on one hand, and that of incurring the censure of John Calvin, who continued for a long time to dictate to them from Geneva, on the other. See Fox's Acts and Monuments. In no instance does Cranmer's spirit of Presbyterianism appear so plain, as in his form of consecrating Bishops.

defective. To this objection Dr. Elrington makes different answers. He says that the mere circumstances of this man being presented for Priesthood and that for Episcopacy, &c. sufficiently determine the power which each candidate receives from the officiating Prelate. To this I reply : then *no form whatever is necessary* in giving orders, but the whole may be performed by dumb show. Speaking of the Priesthood in particular, the Doctor asserts that it is and ever was conferred in his Church by the self-same form (Receive the Holy Ghost : whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven, &c.) by which it is conferred in ours : and then addressing me he indignantly asks : “ Will Mr. Ward’s editor call the validity of the orders conferred in the Church of Rome in question.” \* This challenge I answer in my detailed letter, (of which I am here giving a rough outline) by a dissertation on the essential *constituent power* of Priesthood, which I prove, from Scripture, the holy Fathers, the Canons, and the Rituals of all Christian Churches, in the East and in the West, from the time of the Apostles down to that of the Reformation, and from the sentiments and practice of God’s servants, since the beginning of the world, consists in the *power of offering up sacrifice*. Hence, though you and I should both agree that your form conveys the power of forgiving and retaining sins, Ward intimates that it is still essentially defective, in as much as it neither confers nor is intended to confer the power of sacrificing.—It is true, the Doctor appeals to some ancient liturgies and modern divines against Ward’s argument concerning the necessity of appropriate forms of conferring orders. But here also I meet him in an ample discussion of the ancient Canons,

Sacramentaries, and Treatises on this subject, from the Apostolical Constitutions down to the passage inserted by him from Bossuet; which very passage, without quoting his other very harsh and offensive words, I show makes against the Doctor instead of making for him.

In conclusion, Ward asks in substance this question; (for studying, as I do, perspicuity and brevity, I take his meaning rather than his words): "In case Cranmer's old indeterminate forms of ordination and consecration were valid and sufficient, what occasion was there for changing them to a more determinate form in 1662?"\* Here Dr. Elrington finds himself quite embarrassed, and is unable to give any better answer than the following: "Two forms may be sufficient and valid, and yet one may be preferable to the other."† Had he been acquainted with the circumstances of the case, his embarrassment would have been much greater. These I will mention, without making any comment upon or drawing any conclusion from them. The celebrated Chillingworth had an intimate friend, as persons acquainted with his history know, the Rev. John Lewgar, S. T. B. When he entered into the pale of the Catholic Church, he took his friend along with him, and when he deserted it, as being too confined for his belief

\* The words marked below in italics are those which were added in 1662 to the ancient form; and these, with other alterations, were sanctioned by the Act of Uniformity passed in the same year. "Receive the Holy Ghost *for the office and work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed to thee by the imposition of our hands in the name of the Father, &c.* and remember that thou stir up, &c."——"Receive the Holy Ghost *for the office and work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed to thee by the imposition of our hands.* Whose sins thou dost forgive, &c."

† P. 24.

and practice, he tried to lead back his friend ; but he tried in vain. This friend gave himself up in a particular manner to the study of the ordination controversy, upon which he published different tracts. His most famous tract, entitled *Erastus Senior*, now before me, in which he argues strongly against the vague indeterminate form then in use, was published in the above-mentioned year, at a time when the convocation was sitting, and when, in consequence of the conferences with the Dissenters, which had been held at the Savoy, several important changes in the Liturgy were agreed upon. To be brief, the force of Lewgar's arguments was felt, and the ordination and consecration forms were altered to their present state ; but whether that was done in due time to obviate Ward's objection I need not here mention.

Besides the controversy about orders, you have a second controversy with Ward, or rather with his supposed editor, concerning the Homilies. In defence of these Homilies, now so generally neglected and contradicted by your brethren, you throw down the gauntlet in a manner which renders you answerable for the contents of the whole of them. Indeed, your hardihood is almost unparalleled, when you undertake to reconcile the contradictory passages in these antiquated sermons which Ward has pointed out.——One of these passages asserts that “All sects and degrees of men, women, and children, of whole Christendom, have been at once drowned in abominable idolatry ; of all other sins most detested of God, and most damnable to men, by the space of 800 years and more !” \* while the other teaches that the Holy Ghost has been always present, governing and preserving the Church from the begin-

\* Homil. on Idolatry, part iii.



ning, &c."\* To get out of this dilemma in which Ward has placed you, or rather in which you have placed yourself, you alternately try to break each of its horns, but to no sort of purpose. You first tell us, (after a copious proof of your unacquaintance with the Catholic doctrine, particularly with Bellarmine's Treatise concerning images) that, supposing the Church of Rome to have been drowned in idolatry during the 800 years preceding the Reformation, yet "the Church of Christ is not confined within the limits of the Church of Rome." Acting in the character in which you have placed me, that of Mr. Ward's defender, I prove to you in my dissertation, that the Christians of the East and of the West, of the North and of the South, had no other tenets respecting the articles in question, images, during all those 800 years, than the Church of the diocese of Rome itself had, and I remind you of the unlimited nature of the charge of "damnable idolatry," contained in the Homilies; thus being brought against "all sects and degrees of men, women, and children of whole Christendom; nay, as it is elsewhere expressed, "against all the world." Being foiled on this side, you turn to the other, and assure us that "a Church does not cease to be a Church by becoming corrupt; a true Church and a pure Church not being synonymous terms." But this I prove to be an utter misstatement of the case: the real question being, according to the terms of the Homilies, whether that can be the *true Church of Christ*, which "is drowned in the pit of damnable idolatry;" or, to use your own terms, "whether that can be the elect and faithful people," the depository of God's spirit, and sacred orders, the whole collection of which is "drowned in abominable

idolatry, of all other crimes the most detestable of God, and the most damnable to men?"

The review of this charge of idolatry against the Catholic Church, led Ward back to his former controversy. Accordingly he has dwelt upon the inconsistency and folly of Protestants deriving their priesthood, and even their very Christianity, from notorious idolaters; repeating, after your controvertist Sutcliff: "Antichrist cannot ordain priests in the Church of Christ." To this you answer, from some of our divines, that the schism, or heresy, of the ordaining prelate does not vitiate the orders conferred by him. Thus, Sir, I admit to be true, provided he retains the due matter and form of the respective orders, and provided he intends to do what the Catholic Church does, and would have him do on such occasions. I show, however, that the latter is not to be presumed with respect to downright and "damnable idolaters:" and, by the same rule, I argue that those prelates who neglect the Sacrifice of the New Law, and who held the sacrament to be nothing else but a mere administration of bread and wine, cannot be supposed to have ordained priests for the characteristic office of their order, that of offering up this sacrifice. I point out the momentous consequences that follow from this principle, and likewise from another of first rate importance, which you have totally overlooked. In a word, I prove, that, though Holy Orders themselves could have been transmitted through these eight centuries of dark idolatry, which the homily and you speak of with so much horror, yet that the *divine mission*, or jurisdiction *requisite* for the *exercise of them* must have become utterly *extinct*; inasmuch as this is lost not only by apostacy and idolatry, but also by heresy, schism, excommunication, or even suspension. Following up this principle, I cannot

help showing, at length, that, though Barlow had transmitted the episcopal orders of our Church, it was utterly impossible for him to transmit its jurisdiction; as likewise I remark on the blundering accounts which you and Burnet give of this transaction. According to these it appears that *Barlow confirmed Parker*,\* and, eight days afterwards, *Parker confirmed Barlow*;† that is to say, the father begat the son, and the son begat the father! But I have done with this matter, having already said a great deal more concerning it than I intended to say.

Such, sir, is an imperfect sketch of the letter which I had prepared, and was upon the point of sending to the press, in vindication of myself from your indignant and unmerited attack upon me. But I have considered, 1st, that such a letter would swell the present work to a disproportionate size; 2dly, that the subject of it is of a nature so peculiarly irritating, that it is hardly possible to treat of it at length without giving great and wide-extended offence; 3dly, that it is more for the credit and advantage of our Church that the established clergy should stand upon the apostolical succession, and defend their orders, than that they should contemptuously spurn at them, as the greater part of their eminent writers do in the present age; 4thly, that the line of controversy which I have hitherto invariably followed upon this subject, has been directed against

\* "None coming to (Bow Church) to object against the election (of Parker) they, Barlow, Scory, Coverdale, and Hodgkins, *confirmed it* in the usual manner (viz. Dec. 9.) On the 17th of December, Parker was consecrated." Burnet's Hist. Reform. b. iii. p. 403.

† "Barlow was only a Bishop elect (when he was appointed to consecrate Parker,) but not confirmed." Dr. Elrington, p. 51. Parker being consecrated "afterwards he consecrated Grindal, Cox, &c. and *confirmed Barlow and Scory*." Ibid. p. 109.

the low church latitudinarians of the latter class, and not against the few remaining high churchmen of the former description. Upon the two last of these observations I must explain myself. It is then evidently for the credit and advantage of the Catholic Clergy that you, Gentlemen of the Establishment, should claim a succession from the apostles, through our Church; because thus you cannot pretend to be priests and bishops without allowing us to be priests and bishops also. Hence have only to refer the Lord Redesdales and the Musgraves to you, for a refutation of their objections against our hierarchy. Accordingly it is seen, that when a Friar Kirwan or any other dissipated and loose priest, who is desirous of expatiating in freer fields of belief and practice than our Church allows, he is uniformly admitted into your ministry without any other ceremony than that of abjuring his faith,\* while dissenting ministers of the first distinction who enter into your Church, have never, since the reign of Charles II., been permitted to officiate in it without re-ordination.

To speak now of what I call my own line of controversy upon this subject. In case, Sir, you have dipt into my History of Winchester, and the copious dispute which grew out of it between Dr. Sturges, Chancellor of that diocese, &c. and myself, in consequence of my stating that his patron the celebrated Bishop Hoadly, "had undermined the Church of which he was a prelate,"† you must

\* This Capuchin Friar, who rose to the dignity of a Dean in the Established Church, has left standing evidence of his real belief, and of his motives for professing one contrary to it, in a remarkable sermon which he preached and published in London a little before his change.

† Hist. of Winch. vol. ii. p. 34, first edit. See also Reflect. on Popery by the Rev. J. Sturges, L. L. D. &c, and Letters to a Prebendary.

be informed that one point, which was most warmly contested between us, related to the establishment and continuation of ministers in the Church of Christ. My respectable opponent professed to follow the system of our former common friend, the celebrated Dr. Thomas Balguy, Archdeacon of the diocese, to whose moderation it was certainly owing that he did not become Bishop of Gloucester, and probably also Archbishop of Canterbury. So great was the authority of the latter in the Established Church, that Dr. Sturges, speaking of the very point in question, says of him: "Dr. Balguy has treated this subject with a precision of thought and a correctness of reasoning almost peculiar to the author,"\* and that Dr. Hey, Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, thus recommends him in his public lectures: "As I distrust my own conclusions more than I do his (Dr. Balguy,) if, upon consideration, you do not judge that they are reconcileable, I must exhort you to confide in him rather than in me."† I must add, that the several published discourses of this dignitary, were delivered in charges to the Clergy of the Diocese of Winchester, or preached at the consecration of the most eminent prelates and primates of his communion, that they are dedicated to his present Majesty, and that they never have been controverted by any writer except by myself.‡

\* *Reflect. on Popery*, p. 22. See also Dr. Sturges' *Consideration on the Establishment*, in *Letters to the Bishop of London*.

† Lectures in Divinity delivered in the University of Cambridge, by James Hey, D. D. as Norrisian Professor, vol. ii. p. 104.

‡ Dr. Balguy was perfectly consistent with himself when he answered a question which I put to him at Winchester, in the presence of the late Lord Bristol, Bishop of Derry, &c. that in "case he had been made Archbishop, and an avowed unbaptized Jew had been di-

I mention these circumstances to show the high authority of this divine, and to excuse myself from the task of quoting the doctrine of several other modern divines of inferior talents, though of equal dignity.—His definition of a Church is this: “It is a number of persons agreeing to unite together for the performance of religious duties.” According to this, as I have elsewhere shewn, there is no need of Christ’s institution to form a Church; and we may with as much propriety speak of “the church of Diana of Ephesus, or of Venus of Paphos, as of the Church of England.” Proceeding to show the origin of ministers, and of a liturgy, he never so much as thinks of the apostles, or of Christ, but argues, that “It is highly expedient, if not absolutely necessary, that the offices of religion should be committed to some certain persons, and regulated in some certain manner; but *to whom these offices are to be committed, and in what manner performed, the society itself must judge*, or appoint others to judge for them. We have here,” he adds, “the first sketch of what may be called church authority.”\* Thus you see, that this learned and eminent dignitary of the establishment is not quite sure that there ought to be any ministers of religion at all; but if there must be such, he is entirely convinced, that so far from needing an apostolical succession, or stated form of ordination, or worship, the society itself has a right to determine what sort of persons these shall be, namely, whether bishops or presbyters, or occasional preachers; whether they shall be priests or priest-

rected to him by the King to be consecrated Bishop of an English See, he would certainly have performed the ceremony.”

\* See Discourses, &c. by Thomas Balguy, D. D. Archdeacon, &c. printed by Davies, Holborn, 1785. See also his Sermons on the Consecration of Archbishop Moore and Bishop Hurd.

esses, and whether these offices shall be conferred by the town crier with his bell, or in any other way, and whether the service of religion itself shall consist in praying, preaching, the sacraments, &c., or in shouting and jumping, according to the form of worship observed by the Welsh Methodists.

Such, Sir, is the latitudinarian system concerning orders, to say nothing of the other branches of it, which I long combated in opposition to the most eminent divines and dignitaries of the establishment. Yet, though the controversy was so public as to find its way into the Houses of Parliament, yet every Protestant of note, as well of the clergy as the laity, whom I knew, or could hear of, except the late Bishop Horsley, declared in favor of my chief opponent, Dr. Sturges, and, of course, in opposition to your system of regular succession, as well as to me.<sup>†</sup> It is possible, Sir, that you and your brethren in Ireland, may not have arrived at the philosophic refinement, which, I have said, is so common in England; and that you may, in the sincerity of your heart, have pointed all that train of arguments with which you have thundered upon poor Ward and me. In this case I expect you will ask how members of the establishment could possibly deviate so widely from its primitive doctrine, as my antagonists are proved to have done. I answer this question in the words of the learned Professor of Divinity cited above: “The foundation of all this is *a tacit reformation*, which has taken place in the Church of late years.”\* Dr. Balguy

\* Amongst those illustrious personages who declared in favour of Dr. Sturges and his writings, was the late Lord Chancellor Rosslyn, speaking from the wool sack, July 10, 1800.

† Dr. Hey's Lectures, vol. ii. p. 48. The intelligent Overtan asserts

himself, though the chief stickler against those who petitioned Parliament for an alteration in the articles, &c., some years ago, yet expressly tells us : “ *I am far from wishing to discourage the clergy of the Established Church from thinking for themselves, or from speaking what they think, or even from writing, where the importance of the occasion may seem to demand it ; I only contend that men ought not to attack the Church from those very pulpits in*

that, in virtue of charges which he refers to, of certain prelates now living, the most celebrated for the vigour of their orthodoxy, “ an attendance at these Lectures, is, in many cases, necessary as a qualification for orders.” True Churchman ascertained, p. 24. It may not be amiss to observe, that the celebrated Professor describes this tacit Reformation, as now taking in Socinianism itself. The following are specimens of his public lectures concerning it. “ We and Socinians differ only about what we do not understand—If we allow one another the use of expressions at will (and what great matter can there be in what may almost be called unmeaning expressions,) we need never be upon our guard against each other.” Lect. vol. ii. p. 41.—“ If the Dissenters join us, all they need do is to use, or perhaps be present, while we use a few unmeaning words,” (those professing a belief in the blessed Trinity, and the incarnation of the Son of God.) “ So long as we clearly maintain the Unity of God, why need others scruple a few unmeaning sounds, merely because they seem to interfere with it ?” vol. ii. p. 260.—Among the numerous expedients which have been devised for justifying a solemn oath and subscription to certain articles of religion which the swearer utterly disbelieves, is that of Dr. Hey, who maintains that the words in which they are conceived bear a different meaning from what they did formerly. This he exemplified by referring to the statutes of certain colleges, which I presume are equally sworn to with the articles. Concerning these he says : The clause *I will say so many masses for the soul of Henry VI.* may come to mean : *I will perform the religious duties required of me by those who have authority.*” vol. ii. p. 63.



which they were placed for her defence.”\* He then goes on to insist upon the necessity of keeping up an *appearance of uniformity of doctrine* ; which, in other words, is the necessity of deceiving the people, by teaching a doctrine, in matters of salvation, which frequently is directly contrary to the preacher’s own conviction of the truth. The master both of Dr. Balguy and Dr. Sturges, the renowned Dr. Hoadly, Bishop of Winchester, in a sermon which he preached before the late King, still more expressly inculcates this system of religious dissimulation. He says: “Religious reflection is not the humour of the times, nor can men of any sort be brought to examine their own opinions and popular fashions. We must, therefore, wait till our people are in a better temper, gently and gradually correcting their foolish and erroneous notions and habits: but still taking care *not to offend them with unreasonable truths*: nor to *throw in more light* than the weak optics of men, so long used to sit in darkness, are able to bear.”† I have supposed, Sir, that you and your brethren in Ireland hold this tacit Reformation in abhorrence; and yet from a particular circumstance which struck me the other day, when I visited your superb library of Trinity College, I am not without some suspicion that it may have found its way amongst you also. Viewing the busts which go round the gallery, I observed one which, from the freshness of the marble, I judged must have been very lately placed there, and, of course, should suppose, Sir, with your concurrence, as senior fellow. Impatient to learn what new worthy had been preferred to keep company with the

\* Discourses, p. 20.

† See this quoted by Archdeacon Blackburn, Confessional, p. 376.

Bacons, the Ushers, the Swifts, and other eminent defenders of the Established Church, I hastened to the figure and found it inscribed with the name of Dr. Clayton, Bishop of Clogher, namely, of that very bishop who so loudly called upon his brethren in Parliament to "amend what," he said, "they knew to be amiss," asserting that "no two thinking men ever agreed exactly in their opinion, not only with regard to all the articles, but not even with regard to any one of them."\* However, as it is possible that this suspicion may be ill grounded, as far as you, Sir, are concerned, and that you may resolve upon breaking another lance with me, under the pretence of attacking Ward, I hope, in this case, that you will give me credit for my past defence of the Establishment against her own most favoured sons, and that you will join with me in heartily reprobating the sentiments and conduct, not only of your Patriarchs, Cranmer, Barlow, Grindal, &c. with all the foreign Protestants, but also the publicly avowed opinions of so large and respectable a proportion of your modern brethren. I have reason, indeed, to think, they will not thank you for bringing this discussion forward, as I am witness to the pains they took seven years ago to suppress it: but that is a business in which, of course, I can have no vote. In the mean time I have the honour to remain,

Rev. Sir,

Your's, &c.

† JOHN MILNER.

WOLVERHAMPTON, Dec. 12, 1808.

\* Ibid. p. 248.







